

AN
ANSVVERE TO A CER-
TAINE TREATISE OF THE
CROSSE IN BAPTISME.

Intituled

A Short Treatise of the Crosse in Baptisme, con-
tracted into this Syllogisme.

*No humane ordinance becoming an Idoll may law-
fully be used in the service of God.*

*But the signe of the Crosse, being an humane ordinance
is become an Idoll. Ergo:*

*The signe of the Crosse, may not lawfully be used in the
service of God.*

VVherein not only the weaknesse of the Syllogisme is
selfe, but also of the grounds and proofes there-
of, are plainly discovered.

By L. H. Doct. of Divinitie.

August. Serm. 19. de Sanctis.

*Crossus noster a morte resurrexit, & celos ascendis: Crucem nobis
in memoriam sue passionis reliquit.*

Idem Serm. 130. De Tempore.

Crux Christi, est clavis paradisi, & insigne regni.



Hutten (L.) K

Printed at Oxford by Ioseph Barnes, and are to be
sold in Paules Church-yard at the signe of the
Crowne, by Samuel Waterston, 1605.

Nothing makes me more a stranger
to offer this mine answer to

Your graces view 8 1768 in the year



correlius Burden his hand and pen 1768
There is a generation whose teeth are
as swords and their iron teeth as knives
to devour the poor from off the earth
the needy folk of every men 1768

Correlius Burden his hand and pen 1768



Printed at Oxford by Joseph Bunter, and at the
old in Pines Church yard at the sign of the
Crown by James Wainman, 1807.

TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE
AND MOST REVEREND FA-
ther in God, RICHARD, by the providence of
God, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of
all England & Metropolitane; & one of his Maie-
sties most Honorable Privie Councill.

Nothing makes mee more a
fraid, to offer this mine an-
swere, to your *Graces* view &
censure, then the very length,
which cōtrary to my purpose
and conceit, it is now growne
vnto. For both it may iustly argue me of indis-
cretion; for framing so long an answer to so
short a Treatise: and the longer it is, the more
must it needs be subject to diuers and sundry
oversights. Both which give me iust occasion
much the rather to flie to so safe a sanctuary, as
your *Graces* patronage, not only against them,
who for the matters sake will certainly mislike
it: but euen against them also, who fauoring the
argument, may peradventure iudge the coat too
big for the body, or wish something otherwise
then here they find it. May it please your Grace
therefore to remember, that first this matter of

The Epistle Dedicatory.

the *Crosse in Baptisme*, is that great stumbling block, whereat al our discontented brethren doe take offence; & secondly, that in this small Treatise al the chiefeſt arguments which they vsually make againſt this ſigne, are comprehended: I make no doubt, but that both your *Grace* & al other indifferent Readers, will eaſily pardon my length. Eſpecially becauſe my endeavour was, to giue iuſt ſatisfaction to euery obiection, and ſo leaue nothing vnanswered, that might ſeeme to carry any waight of reaſon with it. which courſe, as I held throughout the whole Treatiſe in generall, ſo more eſpecially in the laſt part. Where our obiections, which the Treatiſer maketh ſhew to ſatiffie, are iuſtified to be too waighty, for ſo flight and incoherent answers, as are fitted vnto them. The Treatiſer more ouer, not only ſomewhat in every part of the Treatiſe, but fully and of reſolved & ſetled purpoſe in the laſt part, maketh great vaunt, that either the Ancient fathers in their times vſed not this ſigne at al in Baptiſme, or if they did, they vſed it to far other purpoſes thē we do now; or laſtly, if they vſed it to any ſuch end yet euen in them it was neuer free from ſinne, and

The Epistle Dedicatory.

and superstition. I thought it therefore a principall part of my duty, somewhat more at large to insist vpon these points, being things in my iudgment not slightly to be passed ouer. And accordingly haue declared, both that the Ancient fathers vsed this consignation of the Crosse in Baptisme in their times, And also that they vsed it, (though to other purposes too) yet even to such ends & purposes, as our Church doth at this day: & lastly, I haue freed (as I trust) aswell our Christian vse thereof, from suspicion of ~~idolatry~~ idolatry, as that vse which the Ancients had of it, from that imputation of sin & superstition, which vniustly is supposed to haue accompanied it in their times. And this I trust may be sufficient excuse and defense for the prolixity of this answer. As for the ouersights and imperfections therein contained, no iust Apology can be made: only I must fly to your Graces fauour, & good acceptance of the Readers. I could haue wished, and from my hart I doe desire, that the late Cōference before his most excellent Maiestie, (so much desired & expected before it came) might haue had that successe wherof there was hope giuen at the first. That

The Epistle Dedicatory.

is either vtterly haue taken away, and made an end of these quarels in our Church, or at the least, after full satisfaction giuen, (which there they had) somewhat abated the heat of their discontentment. That so we all with one hart and one minde, might haue prouided ourselues against that head of Popery, that by these domesticall dissentions getteth dayly strength among vs. But it is come to passe (I knowe not how) that these contētions are since that time, much more rife then they were before, & prosecuted with greater heate thē ever. As though by that meeting in the conference, they had rather taken hart, and greater courage, then any soile; and new strength rather, then any iust reproofe, or satisfaction. Where vppon, as diuers others haue endeouored to answer their exceptions to our Church Ceremonies in generall; so I haue laboured to take out of the way all their scrupels and obiections against this particular of the Crosse in Baptisme. wherein my conscience beareth me record, I haue walked with an vpright hart, and sincere affection; and I verily thinck, according to the truth in this behalfe. If therefore there shall be any thinge

The Epistle Dedicatory

thing found therein, answerable to the worth & dignity of the cause; all that iustly and properly belongeth only to your *Grace*, from whom it tooke the first beginning. If otherwise, I shalbe alwaies ready vpon better information, to reforme my errors and ouersight. How soeuer I commend both it and my selfe to your *Graces* honorable fauour and protection, and shalbe alwaies willing to dispose my labours according to your *Graces* directiō; studying in althings wherein God shal enable me, to aduāce the glory of God, and knowledge of his truth. wherof as God hath made your *Grace* the greatest ornament and pillar in our Church; so I humbly beseech him of his infinite goodnes, to blesse all your religious & careful endeouours for the same; And withal, to giue you many honorable daies and comfortable Assistants in so great a worke; to the glory of his holy name, contentment of his most excellent Maiestie, & perpetuall good of this Church and congregation.

*Your Graces most bounden
and dutifull Chapleine*

LEON. HUTTEN.

things found therein answerable to the word &
dignity of the cause which I am in and to report
ye thought it to your own advantage
to do the best beginning in other words I also
always ready & patient in formation to re-
form my errors and oversight I now found I
commenced from and my letter to your grace
honorable request and protection and I have
always willing to dispose my labours accord-
ing to your grace's bidding in things
wherein God shall enable me to subserve the
roy of God and knowledge of his truth whereof
as God hath made your grace the steward of
meant and place in our Church so I humbly
beseech him of his infinite goodness to bless
all your religion & careful labours for the
king and wish to give you many honorable
days and comfortable assistance to give a
who is to the glory of his holy name, content-
ment of his most excellent Majesty & peace
with good of his Church and congregation.

your grace's most bounden
and dutiful (humble)

LEON. HATTON.



AN ANSWERE TO A TREATISE of the Crosse in Baptisme.

The Title whereof is

**A short Treatise of the Crosse in Baptisme
contracted into this Syllogisme.**

*No humane ordinance becomming an Idoll, may lawfully
be used in the service of God.*

*But the signe of the crosse being a humane ordinance, is be-
come an Idoll. Ergo*

*The signe of the Crosse may not lawfully be used in the ser-
vice of God.*

*This short treatise of the Crosse in Baptisme
consisteth of three principall parts.*

- 1 The maine syllogisme whereinto this whole treatise is contracted.
- 2 The prooffe of the severall partes of this syllogisme.
- 3 The answering of certaine obiections.

THE ANSWERE TO THE WHOLE SYLLOGISME.

*Concerning the maine syllogisme, let vs consider, first a
little of the forme, and then afterwarde come unto the
matter.*

A

IN



N the forme I only obserue, that if the Treatiser had gone ordinarily to worke, and kept himselfe exactly to the termes of his *Major*, the *Minor* would much better, and with lesse suspition of deceipt haue beene conceaved thus:

No humane ordinance becomming an Idoll, may lawfullie be vsed in the service of God.

But the signe of the Crosse is a humane ordinance becomming an Idoll. Ergo

The signe of the Crosse may not lawfully be vsed in the service of God.

For so the ambiguity of the word, *becommig* woulde haue still remained, and we might still haue beene at our choice whether we would take it for *be seeming*, and adding ornament or decencie to an Idoll, or for being made or become indeede an Idoll it selfe. And I marvaile much why the Treatiser held not this course, considering that, *first* it would haue been as auailable for his present purpose, and *secondly* it would stil haue left an impression in the minde of the readers, that no ornamēt, or other thing *be seeming* or *adaing decencie* to an Idol (and they can make what they list an Idol) may lawfully be vsed in Gods service. By which meanes as great a blow woulde haue beene giuen to *Caps, Surplisses, Hoodes, and Copes*, as now by this Treatiser is giuen to the signe of the Crosse.

But the Treatiser (you will say) meant more honestly, and therefore having vsed a word of doubtful signification in the *major*, he very sincerely restrained it in the *minor* to his purposed intent, thereby shewing that he dealt plainly, & intended no deceipt. His sinceritie and true
dea-

dealing is no waies testified by this meanes: for had he indeede meant plainly, and intended no Sophistication, hee woulde haue conceaved his syllogisme in vsuall, and knowne termes, & such as are proper and familiar in this argument of ceremonies, as namely in steede of *humane ordinance* he woulde haue vted *Ecclesiasticall constitution*, for *becomming an Idoll*, he woulde haue said, *abused to Idolatrie*, or *superstitiously abused*, in place of *service of God*, hee woulde haue put *celebrating of Gods service*, and so haue concluded in this, or some such like forme.

No Ecclesiasticall constitution, that sometime hath beene superstitiously abused, may afterwards be reduced to his first lawfull use, and so retained in the celebrating of Gods service.

But the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, is an Ecclesiasticall constitution, that hath sometime beene superstitiously abused. Ergo

The signe of the Crosse in Baptisme may not bee reduced to his first lawfull use, and so retained in the celebrating of Gods service.

This obseruation I make the rather because the very name of *humane ordinance* is alwaies odious, & importeth traditions meereley humane, wicked, impious, and lying, proceeding frō our corrupt nature: for the which cause humane doctrines, the commandements of men, are re-proved by our Saviour: contrarywise the name of *Ecclesiasticall constitutions*, is much more gentle, & gracious, and importeth ordinances made by the Church of Christ, which the very name affordeth to be not meereley humane, and therefore not false, but in part diuine, and therefore good, true, holy, and such as please God. The reason is. The Church is ruled by the spirit of Christ, who is the

*Zaneb. in com-
pend. loco. 26.
pag 640.*

truth, and therefore the traditions of the Church are true and holy. And yet is pleased the Treatiser, in his charity, rather to use *humane ordinance*, then *Ecclesiasticall constitution*, to what purpose and intent let the indifferent Reader iudge.

But because he was to make choice of his termes by his owne iudgment, and not by my direction, I wil therefore follow him in his owne words. And then I say again, that if he had indeede meant honestly, and intended no sophistication, he would in such propositions, as expresse a thing to bee iust or vniust, lawful, or vnlawful, haue set downe the circumstances of time, persons, and place, or such other like. Of time in this sort.

No humane ordinance, once of good vse, that afterwarde became an Idoll, may lawfully be used in the service of God.

But the signe of the Crosse being a humane ordinance, once of good vse, afterwarde became an Idoll. Ergo

The signe of the Crosse may not lawfully be used in the service of God.

Of place, and persons thus.

No humane ordinance becoming an Idoll in the Church of Rome, and amonge the Papists, may lawfully be used in the service of god in the Church of Englande, and amonge the Protestants.

But the signe of the Crosse is a humane ordinance becoming an Idoll in the Church of Rome, and amonge the Papists, Ergo

The signe of the Crosse may not lawfully be used in the service of God in the Church of England, and amonge the Protestants.

For thus the falshood and inconsequence of his argument

gument would easily haue appeared vnto all men. But the Treatiser thought it more for his advantage, to muddle his propositions, concealing all circumstances that mighte giue li-ht to the point in controuersie, and to set down his argument confusedly, the more to stūble the vnskillfull Reader. But leauing the forme of this syllogisme, let vs briefly come to the matter therein contained.

The Mayor:

No humane ordinance becoming an Idol, may
lawfully be used in the service of god.

The answer to the *major*.

The *maior* is merely false, for although the Syllogizer doth verily perswade himselfe, that he hath cunningly contrived into ~~an~~ proposition, two inexpugnable reasons, why the signe of the Crosse may not lawfully be vsed in the seruice of god, the first because it is a humane ordinance, the second because it is become an Idoll, yet there is no truth neither in the one, nor in the other.

Concerning the first, that no humane ordinance is to be vled in the seruice of god; I would faine knowe of the Treatiser what he meaneth *by the seruice of god*. If he meane (*preaching*, which to that sect is now become almost the only seruice of god) I will propose such plaine matter against his assertion, as himselfe shal not be able to contradict. The sentences which *S^r. Paul* borrowed out of heathen Poets, *Aratus*. Acts 17. 28. *Menander*, 1. Cor. 15. 33. *Epimenides*, Titus. 1. 12. were first of humane inuention: for so the Apostle expressly citeth two of them in there severall places. Secondly they were vled in the seruice of god: For the *first* was vled in a sermon to the Athenians; the *second* in that great argu-

ment & heavenly discourse of our resurrection: the third in his instruction to *Titus* how he should carrie him selfe towards them of Crete. And lastly, for anie thing that euer I could learne, they were well and lawfully vsed in gods seruice. For though it haue pleased those that are of opinion with our treatiser, in the humor of there sect, and fauor of there ignorance, viterly to reiect the vse of all humane learning in their sermons, yet I hold it not therfore vnlawfull: And sure I am that, *Ambrosius delectandi gratia utitur sententiarum argutis: Hieronymus poetarum illecebris, et Mimorum salibus: Tertullianus facetijs et iocis: Chrysostomus similibus, collationibus, et metaphoris ad illustrationem et delectationem admirabili artificio concinnatis*, as a learned man speaketh of those fathers.

And Saint *Augustine*, a greater clarke then any they can set against him, is of opinion that *Si qua forte vera, & fidei nostra accommoda dixerunt, non solum formidanda non sunt, sed ab ijs etiam tanquam iniustus possessoribus, in usum nostrum vendicanda*: now if a man vpon these grounds should inferre, that therefore all humane ordinances & inventions are not excluded from the service of God, I marvaile what our Treatiser woulde thinke of his vniversal negatiue proposition.

Secondly, if by the *service of God* he vnderstande the *Leiturgie* and forme of diuine service and praier, then I demaunde what manner of *Leiturgie* there was in the Church of the Jewes till the time of our Saviour. For wee are not to imagine, that in their dayly sacrifices, in their Sabbaths, and new moones, & other festival daies, men assembled only to performe the bare outward actions of killing their sacrifices, and offering their oblations, with-

* De doctr. christ.
Bian. lib. 2. c. 4.

without any forme of praier and Leiturgie for ſuch holy purpoſes. And yet thoſe outward actions only are recorded and regiſtred vnto vs, as being of Gods institution, and thoſe other of praier, and thankſgiving, & vocall ſervice of the congregation (if any ſuch were, as certainly they were) are paſſed over in ſilence without any record or remembrance; which makes me to conceave (and verily I ſhall remaine in that opinion till he reformed) that al other complements were wholly left, & permitted to the direction of the Priests. For had there been any ſuch formes of praier and thankſgiuing instituted by God, they would (noe doubt) ether haue beene recorded by Moſes, as well as there forme of bleſſing the people, mentioned Numb: 6. 24. or preſerved as ſafe as the other Ceremonies and rites of there ſacrifices. And herein I am the rather confirmed by the Titles and Inſcriptions of diuers psalmes, which in the times of thoſe oblations & ſacrifices were vſed in holy meetings. But the whole manner of ordering and diſpoſing of them ſeemeth to haue beene in the Priests and Leuites, and them that had the chiefe gouernment in holy aſſemblies. For ſo much both the ſending of diuers psalmes to the Chaunter, or him, that excelled in muſicke as *Ieduthune*, *Aſaph*, the ſonns of *Corah*: and the names of certaine Instruments, or tunes whereto they were to be ſet, as *Neginoth*, *Shoshannim*, *Alamoth*, and ſuch like, doe moſt manifeſtly import. Alſo I would faine know of the Treater whether the appoinring of the Singers, Priests, and Levites in their orders and courſes, which is aſcribed to *David*, 1. *Chron.* 25. to *Iehoida*, 2. *Chro.* 23. 18. to *Ezechi- as*, 2. *Chron.* 31. 2. were a humane ordinance, or noe? for that it was vſed in Gods ſervice, theſe alledged places

ſui.

sufficiently testifie: and that it was a humane ordinance instituted first by *David*, and renewed afterward by those others, these places following plainly affirme. The song of the Lord began with the trumpets & instruments of *David* King of *Israell*. 2. *Chron*: 29. 27. *Ezechias* the King and Princes commaunded the *Levites*, to praise the Lord with the words of *David*, and *Asaph* the kinges seer. 2. *Chron*. 29. 30. and after the captivitie, *Ioshua* the Priest, and *Zerubbabell* the governour, appointed the Priests in their apparel with trumpets, & the *Levites* the sonnes of *Asaph* with Cymbals, to praise the Lord after the ordinance of *David* King of *Israel*. *Esa*: 3. 10.

Thirdly if by the *service of God*, he meane the *outward ceremonies* of our religious carriage, and behavior while we are in the Church hearing Gods word, and praying vnto him in the congregation, I would knowe whether those ordinances which the Apostle *S. Paul* prescribeth That women should keepe silence in the Church 1. *Cor*. 14. 34. That men should pray bare headed and women couered. 1. *Cor*. 11. 4. That men comming together to the Lords supper should stay one for another, and that prophane feasting should not be mingled with the Lordes Supper. 1. *Corinth*. 11. 17. whether I saie these, and many such like were of humane institution or diuine? If they were of mans ordinance, then the Treatise is much mistaken, for al these belonged to the service of God, if they were not of humane but diuine institution, how then doth he cal them *My things*, *The ordinances that I haue deliuered*? 1. *Cor*. 11. 2. and why speakes he not in Gods person, but his owne? *I will* that men pray euery where lifting vp pure hands. That women array themselves in comely apparel. 1. *Tim*: 2. 8, 9. and, *I permit* not

a wo-

a woman to teach. 1. Tim. 2. 12. If the Treatiser shal say that in al these examples formerly alleadged, those men were ledde by the spirit of God, & therefore what soeuer they appointed was Gods ordinance, my answere there vnto is, that now also the Church of God is guided by the same spirit: and as now, so even then also, there was a difference to be made betweene those things which God commanded in such actions, & those things which were ordered by men: else the scripture would neither so expressely haue mentioned such thinges to haue bin done by such men, as in the former examples: nor S^r. Paule haue spoken in his own person soe resolutely, as in the latter. A manifest prooffe wherof we may drawe out of the same Apostle speaking of a matter of greater importance, namely marriage, 1. Cor. 7. where he would not haue acknowledged, that some thing he spake by *permission*, and some other things by *Commandement*, as in the 6. verse, nor haue so exactly distinguished between the *Lord commandeth* & *not I*, speaking of equal marriages, verse. 10. and *I commande*, and *not the Lord*, speaking of vnequal marriages, verse. 12. But onely to giue vs to vnderstand, that in these matters of ceremony and outward order, where he vseth not Gods expresse authoritie, there he speaketh of his owne iudgment, directed alwaies, as him selfe verily thinketh. 1. Cor. 7. 40. by the spirit of God.

Hitherto I haue spoken only of those things, wherin I wold willingly be instructed, concerning the Leiturgies of the old testamēt til the apostles times. Now, if I should resume the same points, & discourse of them, as I finde them to haue been vled in the Primitiue Church & immediate ages next after the apostles, I should presse the

treatise with such a multitude of examples aboue al ex-
 ception, as must needs ouerthrow his weake position.
 For first for sermons, both in there preachings and in
 there writings, how ful of humane arts and secular lear-
 ning are the auncient holy fathers? For although in the
 end and scope of there learning, * *Quid adeo simile Philo-
 sophus et Christianus? Gratia discipulus et calisfama ne-
 gotiator, et vitæ?* &c yet in the commerce and inter-
 course of there knowledge, as on the one side, *Quis poe-
 tarum? quis Sophistarum qui non omnino de Prophetarum
 fonte potauerit? ut facile credatur diuinam literaturam,
 thesaurum fuisse posteriori cuiq; sapientia:* so on the o-
 ther side, * *Nonne aspiciamus quanto auro et argento et
 veste suffarcinatus exierit de Aegypto Cyprianus doctor
 suauissimus, et Martyr beatissimus? quanto Lactantius,
 quanto Victorinus, Optatus, Hylarinus,* and to omit
 the rest, *quanto ipse qui hoc scribit Augustinus?* So that
 in those times, * *Philosophia humana suis armis confecta
 obmutuit;* and there was not anie one of the auncient fa-
 thers, that was not able to conuince prophane Poets,
 Sophisters, & Philosophers, out of their own principles
 and superstitions, God in his wildome soe giueing gifts
 to those his most worthie instruments, that they, * *Tan-
 quam periti Musici gratum et iucundum decantantes car-
 mē, super vacaneas quoq; percurrere plectro chordas potu-
 erint, et ornatus gratia supra eas que ex usu sunt, alias
 etiam adijcere.*

Secondly for the Leiturgies & forme of diuine seruice
 in those times, as we do willingly acknowlegd, al things
 to haue beene of far more simple and plain e obseruari-
 on, then they came afterward vnto, so it cannot be deni-
 ed, but that euen then also *humane ordnances* & inven-
 tion,

Tertull. in A-
 pol. cap. 46.

Aug. de doct.
 christi. li. 2. c. 40.

Lactant. lib. 4.

Niceph. Cal.
 lib. 8. cap. 29.

tions were vsed in Gods seruice : for what else shal wee
 cal, and to what head shal we refer, the Leiturgies of S^r.
James vsed in the Church of *Ierusalem*? of S^r. *Basill* vsed
 in the Church of *Casarea Cappad*? of S^r. *Chrysostome* v-
 sed in the Church of *Constantinople*? of S^r. *Clement*, vsed
 in the Church of *Rome*? and generally of all those other
 famous Leiturgies mentioned in the Ecclesiastical hi-
 stories, and recorded to haue been vsed in seueral Chur-
 ches in the most flourishing state of the Primitiue
 Church? what conceipt shal we haue of those zealous &
 religious Christians, that haue in al ages, and in al Chur-
 ches, without any interruption, so devoutly song, & laid,
Athanasius, and the *Nicene* Creede? what of the hea-
 venly dittie, *Te Deum*, compiled by S^r. *Augustine*, and
 S^r. *Ambrose*, and from them derived into al Churches?
 what of the sacred hymne *Trisagium*, vsed first in the
 Church of *Constantinople*, & afterward commended to
 the world by the councel of *Calcedon*? what of so manie
 excellent hymnes, verses, *Antiphonies*, *Responsories*, *Roga-*
tions, and *Letanies*, as we read to haue beene made by S.
Gregory Nazianzen, S. *Hilarie*, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Augu-*
stine, *Synesius*, *Prudentius*, *Gregorie the great*, *Sedulius*,
 and diuers others, vsed continually in the Church? And
 lastly, (to auide infinite examples to this purpose) what
 shal we thinke of the fourth Couñcel of *Toledo*, that doth
 iustifie the saying of praiers, & singing of hymnes made
 by men, against such as woulde haue nothing vsed in the
 church, but what is in the Canonical scriptures, or hath
 beene receiued by the Apostles? *Quia nonnulli hymni hu-*
mano studio in laudem Dei, atq. Apostolorum, & Marty-
rum triumphos compositi esse noscuntur, sicut y quos beatis-
simi Doctores Hylarius & Ambrosius condiderunt, quos ta-

Conc. Tolosa. 4.
 Canon. 12.

De consec. dist.
 1. ca. de hymnis

men quidam specialiter reprobant, pro eo quod de scripturis
sanctorum Canonum, vel Apostolica traditione non exi-
stant; respuant ergo & illum hymnum ab hominibus compo-
situm, quem to sine omnium Psalmorum dicimus, gloria &
honor patri, & filio, & spiritui sancto, &c. Similiter & to-
tum illud, quod sequitur post Angelicum hymnum, gloria in
excelsis Deo, &c. quod tamen Ecclesiastici Doctores compo-
suerunt, &c. I haue the more willingly repeated the most
part of the Canon, because it so fitly meeteth with the
thwart humor of certaine men of our time, who scoffing-
ly and in contempt cal those godly songs made by men
(which are ioined in the same volume with our singing
Psalmes) Ballads & Jigges and such like names, and can
abide nothing but the *Geneua* Psalmes (as they cal them)
to be sung in our Christian congregations. As if they
certainely were Gods word it selfe, & not rather expo-
sitions and paraphrases made by men.

Rege. epist. 8.

Thirdly, for the rites and ceremonies of those times it
must be remembred that first for a lōg space in the church,
they were Iudaical, either because mē borne & brought
vp in the Iewish Pædagogie, knewe not what belonged
vnto Christian liberty, or else because many worthy and
famous men in those daies were of opinion, that all the
Iewish ceremonies, could not suddenly be abrogated,
without the great offence & scādal of the weaker sort. Of
which opinion it seemes S^r. *Augustine* also was, who of-
tentimes praiseth and commendeth this saying, *Iudaicā*
Synagogam cum honore fuisse sepeliendam. Secondly it is
to be observed, that they were diuers & sundrie in diuers
Churches, according to that saying of *Socrates*. *Omnes*

Secret. l. 1. c. 21.

Enseb. hist. Ec.

cles. lib. 3. c. 23.

Ecclesiarum ritus qui in singulis urbibus, regionibusq. v-
surpantur, scriptis mandare ut valde laboriosum est, ita

vix

vix aut ne vix quidem fieri potest. Eiusq, enim religionis & sectæ varij sunt ritus, licet eadem de ipsis habeatur opinio, & qui in eadem fide consentiunt, ijdem ritibus & ceremonijs inter ipsos discrepant.

Thirdly, it must also be remembred that they were *libera observationis*, no one Church prescribing to another, nor condēning another for diversity of ceremonies, but every one following their owne customes, and vsing that freedome that is agreeable to christian liberty. This point is fully proued by many particulars in the place formerly alleadged out of *Socrates*, & most plainly delivered vnto vs, not only in the example of S^t. *Ambrose*, *Cum Romam venio, ieiuno Sabbato, cum hic (Mediolani) sum, non ieiuno*, but also by his advise and counsell commended to S. *Augustine*, *Sic etiam tu ad quā forte Ecclesiam veneris, eius morem serua, si cuiquam non vis esse scandalum, nec quengquam tibi.* Which advise and counsel of S. *Ambrose*, as often as S^t. *Augustine* thought vpon, he alwaies embraced as an oracle from heaven, because hee had often found, and with much griefe lamented, that many weake brethren were troubled by the contentious obstinacy, and superstitious feare of some men, who in those matters, which cannot certainly be resolved vpon, neither by the authority of the scriptures, nor by the traditiō of the vniuersal church, became so troublesome that they thought well of nothing, but what they did them selues: Either because they had some sleight reason for there opinions, or because the custome of there Cōuntry was otherwise, or because they had seene things otherwise carried in some places where they had traualled, and therefore thought best of that, which they had learned furst hest from home. Nowe out of these premis-

*Aug. ep. 118.
ad Iannarium.*

fer, we may gather this firme and sure Conclusion, That therefore the Ceremonies of those times were certainly of humane ordinance: or, to speake more properly, of Ecclesiasticall Constitution. For had God given any law concerning the, neither could the Jewish rites haue continued so long, neither could they haue bin so diuers as they were, neither could they haue bin of so free obseruation, but that one church must needs haue bin scandalized by another. And although this were sufficient to infringe the Treatisers proposition: yet I will giue the Reader a little taste of those things only, which antiquity hath alwaies commended in this kinde, that he may thereby be induced, to thinke the more reverently of Church Ceremonies. The translation therefore of the Sabbath into the Lords day, and that men praied with their faces towards the East, of whose ordinance and institution were they?

Aug. de Tem.
Serm. 25.

Of the first S^r. *Augustine* plainely affirmeth. *Apostoli & Apostolici viri, & sancti Doctores Ecclesie, decreuerunt omnem gloriam Iudaici sabbatismi, in illam transferre.*

Respon. ad orthodox. qu. 113.

The second also is very ancient as *Iustine Martyr* witnesseth referring it to the Apostles. *A quibus morem orandi accipit Ecclesia, ab ijsdem etiam locum accepit, viz. à sanctis Apostolis.* In like manner we read that our Lord and Saviour instituted his supper in the Evening, and after meate, *Cum autem illi manducarent accepit Iesus panem,*

Mat. 26.

&c. From whence then is it, that now for fixe hundred years, it is receaved in the morning, & before men eate?

Aug. ep. 118. ad
Jannarium.

For the former S^r. *Augustine* saith, *Saluator quo vehementius commendaret mysterij illius altitudinem, ultimum hoc voluit insigere cordibus & memoria discipulorum, à quibus ad passionem digressurus erat. Et ideo non precepit quo deinceps ordine sumeretur, ut Apostoli, per quos Ecclesie dis-*

dispositurus erat, servaret hunc locum. For the latter hee demandeth, *Nunquid propterea calumniandum est universa Ecclesia quod à ieiuniis semper accipitur?* ex hoc enim placuit spiritui Sancto ut in honorem tanti sacramenti, in os Christiani prius Dominicum corpus intraret, quam exterius cibi. This custome was in vse therefore every where in his time, except only in some few parts of Egypt in the cuntries neere vnto *Alexandria* and *Thebais*, as *Socrates* observeth, *Quos probabilis quaedam ratio delectavit, &c.* as *S. Augustine* speaketh in the same Epistle. It was afterwarde commanded in the third provincial councell of *Carthage*, *Can. 29.* and lastly confirmed by the sixt general councell in *Trullo.* The like may be said of the Institution of Hollydaies, of Lent, of kneeling in the time of public praier vsed all the yeare long, save only on Sundaies and Pentecost, on which daies the custome was, *orare stantes*, to stand while they praied, for such like reasons peradventure as *Iustine Martyr* yeelds for it. Lastly those ceremonies in praier mentioned by *Chrysostome*, *Cum manus extendis, pectus tundis, faciem in cælum erigis, & oculos aperis, quid aliud facis, quam ut totum hominem ostendas Deo?* And those other spoke of by *Tertullia*, *Illuc, id est in cælum, suspicientes, manibus expansis, capite nudo, genibus posit is, manibus cadentibus pectus, facie humi volutata.* As also that they stood vp at the reading of the Gospels, & kneeled at the Sacrament, what other ground had they then humane Institution? And I trust that that ceremony of *virorum prior, faminarum posterior ad mensam accubitus*, and all those others, which our newe reformers would haue brought in, either in their standing, or sitting, or walking at the Communion, if they might haue prevailed, in their generall projects of a forme of Church

Aug. ad Jan. ep. 119. cap. 19. Tertull de coron mill. cap. 2.

Iust. Mart. respons. ad orthod. qu. 115.

Chrysost. in illa verba veri adoratores in sp. & ver. adorabunt.

Tertull. Apol. cap. 30. & contra Iudeos cap. 10.

Bez. ep. 24. ad B.

Church Leiturgie, and of a Church discipline so often
tendred to the Parliament, would in short time haue
proved no better. then *humane devises and inuentions*,
though neuer so fayrely coloured with the names of *A-*
postolicall customes, and honored with the most glorious
tides of, *The most holy Discipline, the scepter of Christ,*
and full placing of him in his kingdome. Concerning the
second, *that nothing becoming an Idoll* may lawfully be
vled in the seruice of God. Before I come to answer the
proposition, J desire the Reader a litle to obserue the
Treatisers phrased, and manner of speech. His phrase is
becomming an Idoll: will you know the reason? Hee had
not spoken home enough, if hee had only said *being abu-*
sed, for the word *abused*, would haue implied a good vse
once, which the Treatiser perhaps will not admit that
there was ever any of the Crosse. Neither thought he it
sufficient to say *abused to Idolatrie*, for then perhaps, it
would haue been too hard a talke for him to proue, that
nothing abused to Idolatrie may lawfully be vled, in Gods
service. And therefore there was no remedy, his phrase
must needs be, *becomming an Idoll*. But how, I praie you,
may a humane ordinance become an Idoll? Doe you in-
tende by this speech a *Metamorphosis*, or *Transub-*
stantiation, whereby it ceaseth to be the nature it was,
and is turned into a nature it vvas not? But that is
cleane against the Apostles minde, who saith that *I-*
dolum nihil est in mundo. Your meaning then must bee,
that by the cogitation and minde of men, ascribing deity
to the ordinance, it was framed and made an Idoll. For o-
ther essence and *becomming* it can haue none. What
then needed this far fetched speech *becomming an Idoll*?
But that perhaps you meant thereby to expresse your
zeale

zeale, or rather, as I suppose, to astonish the ignorant, & make the signe of the Crosse more suspected, and odious to the people. But leauing the Treatisers speech let vs come vnto his matter.

And here I must debate a litle with the Treatiser, whether the *matter* of an *Idoll*, (for the forme we see by the Apostles doctrine is none, but only in the minde and cogitation of the Jdolater) whether I say, the matter of an *Idoll*, being siluer or golde, brasse, leade, or stone, &c. after it is altered & reclaymed from the Jdolatrous vse, may not aswell be vled in Gods seruice, as Churches, or Lands, or vessels may, which sometimes haue beene consecrated vnto Idols: I am of opinion it may. For as *Tertullian* speaketh, *De simulacbris ipsis nihil aliud deprehendo, quam materias sorores esse vasculorum, instrumentorumq. comunium*: and that therfore as they Jdolaters them selues, *Publicos et domesticos deos publicâ et domesticâ potestate tractarunt, pignerando, vendicando, demutauit in Cacabulum de Saturno, in trullam de Minerva*, every man as his present will or necessitie required, so wee, abandoning the superstition, and imbracing the Creature, which God at the beginning made good, may apply it to his seruice. My reason is this. while the *Idoll*, & they things consecrated to the *Idoll*, were both abused to Idolatrie, they were both equally distant frô God, and alike removed from his seruice, differing noe otherwise, then that the *Idoll* was the thing worshipped, and the consecrated thinge, that where with it was worshipped. And suppose the *Idoll* were a litle farther estranged from God, a'nd a stepp further in the power of the Deuil, yet, *Non desinit esse eius qui creauit*, No creature of God can be so farre alienated from him, *ut*

Apol. cap. 12. & 13.

*non possit quando vult repetere. Nihil enim ita est sub
poteestate Diaboli, quin ad gloriam et honorem dei possit con-
verti. If this be granted (and as I thinke it wil not be de-
nied) then this phrase to become an Idoll, importeth in ef-
fect no more, then to be abused to Idolatrie, or to be cō-
secrated to the service of an Idol. Whereby it wil come
to passe, that whatsoeuer may be alleadged, for the good
and lawful vse of things in Gods service, that were some-
times abused to Idolatry, the same also may be alleaded
to proue, that even that thing also may haue a good and
right vse in Gods service, which sometimes hath beene*

*Tertull. de Ido-
las, cap. 8.*

*an Idol it selfe. Nec enim differt, saith Tertullian, Si ex-
trinas, vel exornes, si templum, si aram, si adiculam eius ex-
truxeris, si bracteam expresseris, aut insignia, aut etiam do-
mum fabricaveris. Nay he goeth farther and plainly as-
firmeth, Maior est eiusmodi opera, quæ nō effigiem cōfert,*

Wild. 13. 16.

*sed authoritatem. And in very truth the Artificer that
made it knoweth well enough, that it is but woode or
stone, &c. Nondum Deus saxum est, lignum, aut argentū;
Ecce ornatur, consecratur, oratur, tum postremo Deus est,
cum homo illi valuit, & dedicavit, saith Minutius, The
greatest fault then is in him, that by erecting, adorning,
and adoring of it, procureth vnto it the credit and opini-
on of a God. For by this meanes, Etiam qui non inuenit
vitalem motum, credit numen occultum: seductus forma, et
commotus auctoritate, sine vivo aliquo Habitatore esse non
putat.*

*Aug. in Psal.
113.*

Hauiing laide this foundation, I come nowe to ex-
amine the Treatisers proposition. And first, if we consi-
der it in *Thesi*, That nothing once abused, may ever af-
ter bee well vsed, but must bee utterly abrogated and re-
iected. It will easely appeare to be, most vntrue, not on-
lie

ly in thinges naturall and artificiall, which haue beene exceedingly abused: (for so wine must bee gone, because it hath beene abused vnto drunkennes: meats, because some haue abused them to gluttonie: words, because by some cruell hands they haue beene imbrued in innocent bloude) but euen in those things also, which are layd to be the deuiles & inuentions of prophane & heathenish Idolators, nay, euen of the heathen Gods the Ielues, which yet might be thought most vnlike to be fitted to holy vses, for that they haue proceeded from such corrupt fountaines. Of things naturall, S^r. *Augu.* *Aug. Epist. 154 ad Publicolam.* *stines opinio is, Si de arca vel torculari tollatur aliquid ad sacrificia Daemoniorum, etiam sciente Christiano, tamen utitur mundis reliquis fructibus, unde illa sublati sunt, &c.* Euē as we vse those fountains, out of which we most certainly knowe, that water is drawn for the vse of sacrifices. Neither doubt we to fetch our breath frō that aire, into which we knowe, that the smoke of al the altars, and incense of Deuils doth goe. For we must beware, least that if we shall suppose, that we may not eate those herbes which growe in the garden of the Tēple of an Idoll, it also followe, that wee imagine, that the Apostles ought not to haue eaten bread in Athens, because it was the Citty of *Minerva*, & consecrated to her Deitie. This also may we answer of that well and fountaine which is in the Temple, and of those sacrifices which are cast into the well and fountaine: nay more, which are therfore cast into the water, to doe sacrifice vnto the waters, Neither must we therfore refuse the benefite of this light, because they sacrilegious, when so they can, cease not to sacrifice vnto the same. Sacrifice also hath beene offered vnto the windes, which not

withstanding wee vse to our manifold commodity, although they themselves seeme as it were to draw in, and sucke vp the smoke of those sacrifices. Of artificial things likewise S^r. *Augustines* iudgment is the same. *Neg, enim pro patria non est miles armandus, quia contra patriam nonnulli arma sumpserunt.* Nor therefore may not the good and skilful Phisitions vse medicinal yrons for cure, and safety, because the vnskilful and ill-disposed men, doe vse the same for death and destruction. Otherwise no yron were to bee vsed either in house or field, for feare least some man should therewithal slay himselfe, or others: nor must there be a tree, or a corde remaining, for feare least any man should hang himselfe. Neither must vve make any windowes, for feare least some one or other should cast himselfe headlong from the same. *Tertullian* also is of the same opinion, not only concerning those things, but of such things also as haue beene vsed and invented by the *Pagan* Gods. For, *Primus Mercurius litteras excogitauerit, &c.* Let it be so (saith he) that *Mercury* was the first that invented *letters*, yet for al that I wil acknowledge them to be necessary, both for matters of commerce amongst men, and also for our studies towards God. Nay, say also that hee likewise invented *Musicke*, neither wil I denie (knowing what *David* did) but that this invention also was agreeable to the Saints, & ministered in the service of God. Let *Aesculapius* be the first inventor of *medicines*: why, I remember that *Esaie* ministered a *medicine of figges* vnto *Ezechias* being sicke: and *Paule* could tel *Timothy*, that a litle wine was good for his stomacke, and for his many infirmities. Yea, and though *Minerva* also first framed a *ship*, yet I see that *Ionas* and the *Apostles* sailed in *ships*. And, which is more, though every

Tertull. de coron. mill. cap. 8.

Vide August. de doct. Christ. li. 2 cap. 18.

every thing, and veſſel neceſſarie for our uſe, had one of the heathen Gods to bee the author, yet that is no cauſe why Chriſt ſhould not be cloathed, or S. Paule not weare a cloake. And J muſt confeſſe alſo that Chriſt lay vpon a bed, and vſed a baſon when he waſhed his Diſciples feet: and that he powred water out of a piſcher, and was girded about with Linnen, the ſtuffe peculiar to Oſiris. Laſtly, *Ariſtotele* ſpeaking of the uſe of *Logicka & Rhetorick*, *Si obijciatur* (ſaith he) *quod valde nocebit is, qui utatur in iſte huiusmodi facultate rationū*, why this is an ordinary obiection againſt al good things (vertue only excepted) and noſt of al againſt thoſe things, which are moſt profitable, as ſtrength, health, riches, militarie diſcipline, &c. For theſe be things, which a man may doe much good withal, if he vſe them iuſtly; and exceeding much hurt, if he vſe them vniuſtly. The reaſon hereof is, becauſe the euill vſing of good things, proceedeth only from the corrupt nature of the uſer, and therefore cannot alter the goodnes of the creatures, which God hath made, and ſtamped vpon them this marke, that God ſaw that every thing that he had made, was exceeding good.

Ariſt. Rhet. lib. I. cap. 1.

Gen. 1.

The ſelfe ſame reaſon alſo holdeth in *Hypotheſis*, to what thing ſo ever a man wil apply it, and is moſt true euen in the point we haue now in queſtion. Things abuſed to Idolatrie, nay euen to make an Idol it ſelfe, haue not therefore loſt al manner of good & holy vſe, becauſe the fault was not in the things ſo abuſed, but in the that abuſed them ſo. A prooſe hereof we haue in the Apoſtle S. Paul, who vſed that thing in the ſervice of God, whereof other men had made an Idol. For I demands. The altar in *Athens*, hauing this inſcription, *unto the unknown God*, was it not a thing conſecrated to an Idol? Or rather,

not to digresse from the Treatisers phrased, was it not become an Idoll it selfe? I suppose the Treatiser will not deny it: for *S. Paule* reckons it among their superstitions, because they worshipped, they knew not what. And did not *S. Paul* vse it in the service of God? No doubt he did, when hee tooke the Inscription thereof for the text and theame of his sermon. Whom you ignorantly worship, him shew I vnto you. Lastly, did he not vse it lawfullie in Gods service? I am perswaded hee did, both because the *Athenians* could not be better conuincd, then by their owne ignorant deuotions and superstitions, and also because God gaue a blessing to this sermon, in *Diomysius Arcopagite*, and *Damaris*, and diuers others: according to the obleruation of *Cassiodore* in the *Tripartite* historie. *Ille sancto spiritu ditatus, multos Atheniensium adduxit ad fidem, quando ea quae in ara erant scripta, sensu propria narrationis exposuit.*

*Hist. Tripart.
lib. 9 cap. 29.*

Judg. 6. 25.

If this example will not content our Treatiser, I remitt him ouer to the 6. Chapter of *Iosuah* ver. 17. and likewise to the 6. Chapter of *Iudges* ver. 25. In the former place the Cittie of *Ierico*, and al the wealth therein was made *Anathema*, an execrable thing vnto the Lord: & yet all the siluer, & gold, and vessels of brasse & yron were consecrated vnto the Lord, and commanded to be brought into his Treasurie. In the latter place God commanded *Gedeon* to destroy the altar of *Baal*, and to cut downe the groue that was by it, and yet he would also haue the wood of the groue that was cut downe, and the bullocke that *Ions* the father of *Gedeon* had stalled seuen yeares, & had so long before ordained for a sacrifice vnto *Baal*, to be offered to himselfe for a burnt offering. And why al this? but to make it manifest that God is the Lord

Lord of all things, and that nothing can be ſo farre gone into the power of the Devil, but it may be againe reclaimed to the honor, & ſervice of God. For although *Moses* in the golden Calfe, and *Ezechias* in the braſen Serpent, ſhewed each of the a memorable example of their religious zeale, and juſt anger againſt Idolatrie: the one by burning the Calfe in the fire, grinding it into powder, & throwin it vpon the water, and making the people drink thereof. The other by breaking the Serpent in peeces, and calling it *Nebuſthan*, a vile and contemptible peece of braſſe: yet thoſe actions rather commend the zeale of thoſe good Princes, deteſting the Idolatry and Idols theſelves, then are any waies left for a neceſſarie rule for other men. For whereaſ there are two things memorable in theſe actions, the one, the taking away of the Idolatry, the other, that vtter deſtroying, and abolishing, of the Idols; The firſt, is left to Chriſtian Princes & Magiſtrates for an example of imitation: The latter, as it increaſeth a commendation of their zeale, ſo it impoſeth no neceſſity on other men to doe the like: as may appeare, not only by the two former examples commanded by God himſelfe, but alſo by many other worthy, and famous re- formations made by Chriſtian Princes, in the Primitive Church. Among whom one *Theophilus* is commended in the Tripartite hiftorie, for faithfullie perſourming the commandement of *Theodoſius* the Emperour, who had given him commiſſion, to deſtroy al the heathen Idols in *Alexandria*, & to imploy the matter and riches of them, to good and holy uſes. According to which commande- ment, *Idola Deorum deſtructa à Theophilo; ex mandato Theodoſij Imperatoris, conſtabantur ad faciendas ollas, & ad Alexandrinæ Eccleſiæ diuerſos uſus, cui ab Imperatore*

*Hift. Tripart.
lib. 9. cap. 27.*

Epist. 154. ad
Publicolan.

donati fuerunt Dijs, ad expensas egentium. Many examples of the same *Theodosius*, and of *Constantine* the great in former ages, as also of other Christian Princes & Magistrates in their several times, might be alleadged to this purpose. But I wil conclude this point with the most iudicious sentence and resolution of S^r. *Augustine*, whereby he confirmeth whatsoever I haue spoken. *Cū sempla, Idola, luci, &c.* when Tēples, Idols, groues, or any things of like quality, by authorized power are ruinated and cast downe, if they be translated into common, and not proper vles, & converted to the honor of the true God, that falleth out in them, which hapneth also in men, when as of sacrilegious and vngodly persons, they become pliable and conformed to the true religion. And well may vvee imagine, that God hath intimated and taught vs this, in those testimonies which he laid before vs, when he commaunded that the woode which grewe in the groues of strange Gods, should be vsed in the holocaust, and that al the gold, and siluer, and brasse of *Ierico*, shoulde bee brought into the Lords treasurie. If this iudgement of S^r. *Augustines* be true, then it is as lawful to vse the matter of an Idol, or to speak in the Treatisers language, that very thing that was become an Idoll, in the service of God, if it be reclaimed and remoned from Idolatrous superstition, as it is for a man, from an *Infidell* to become a *Christian*, or from an euil and wicked man, to become a true convert, and faithfull servant of God. And thus much to be answered to the *Maior*.

The Minor.

But the signe of the Crosse, being a humane ordinance, is become an Idoll.

An-

Answer to the minor.

In the minor likewise there are two things comprehended.

First that the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme is a humane ordinance, which none of vs ener denied, but doe willingly acknowledg with *Tertullian* that, *Si legem expostules scripturarum nullam inuenies. &c.* And yet we cannot see, how this may ether aduantage the Treatisers cause, or exclude the signe of the Crosse, from being a lawfull and commendable Ceremonie, in the service of God.

But for all that I must desier the Treatiser, that he and I may demurre a little longer vpon this point. For, notwithstanding al that is already graunted, me thinks I may further say, that it is so a humane ordinance, as it is also a diuine, It is a diuine ordinance, in as much as it is a part of that decency, which is commended vnto vs by the Apostle: and it is a humane constitution, in as much as it doth particularly designe that, which in the generall was pointed at, rather then expressed. And this doctrine I learne of M^r. *Caluine* him selfe, who giueth this rule, *quia in externa disciplina, et ceremonijs &c.* Because God in outward discipline, and Ceremonies, would not prescribe any thing seuerally for vs to follow, (for that he fore-saw that those things would depend most vpon the condition of times, neither iudged he one forme agreeable to al ages) in this case we must resort to those generall rules which he hath giuen, that according there vnto, al things may be examined, what soeuer the necessitie of the Church shall require to be commanded. Him selfe followeth this rule, and by the Ceremonie of kneeling in the time of solemne praiers,

Calu. Instit. lib. 4. cap. 10.

2. Cor. 14. 40.

which he vseth as an example for illustration, he giueth vs this generall directiō, how to iudge of this whole matter of Ceremonies. Namely out of S^r Pauls generall exhortation, *Let all things be done decently & in order*, to deduce every particular after this sorte.

What soeuer Ceremonie is done decently, and in order, is a part of S^r Pauls generall exhortation.

But the Ceremonie of kneeling at solemne praiers, is done decently and in order, Ergo.

It is a part of S^r Pauls generall exhortation.

Now because the Treatiser and his adherents, will hardly belieue that this particular Ceremonie of the Crosse in Baptisme, can as iustly, as that of kneeling be deduced, and applied out of this generall, I wil out of M^r. Caluins own grounds cleare this point also.

First this Ceremonie of the Crosse in Baptisme, hath in it that *Decorum* or *Decency*, that by M^r. Calvin is required. *Decorum*, or *decency*, as he teacheth, consisteth in these points. That it be so agreeable to the reuerence of holy mysteries, as it may also be a fit exercise to piety, or at the least, that it adde a bewtie or ornament fit and agreeable to the action. And that not without fruit, but so as it may admonish the faithfull, with what modesty, religion, and obseruance, they should handle sacred things. All these parts of *Decorum* are in the Crosse.

It is agreeable to the *reuerent* maiestie of *sacred mysteries*. For what can be more agreeable to holy mysteries then the signe of that, which was the *consummation*, and *accomplishment* of *all holy mysteries*? Then the signe of that, whercon he hath nayled the Bill that was against vs: through the bloud of which Crosse, he hath set at peace, both the things in earth, and the things in heaven.

heaven. Secondly, it is a fit *exercise* vnto pietie. For, *Ad Christū rectā nos ducit*, It leadeth vs directly vnto Christ and putteth vs in minde of him that died for vs, shadowing out vnto vs, the height, and breadth, length & depth of his loue, as S. *Augustine* sheweth in diuerse sermons. Thirdly, it is an ornament, *Quia crux Christi gloria Christiani*. an ornament fit and agreeable to the action: The action is the receauing of the child, into the body of Christ, and therefore most agreeable it is, that the childe shoulde even then be signed, with the marke & badge of him, in to whose service he is presently receaved. Fourthly, it is not without fruit, but doth admonish the faithfull, with what modestie, religion, and obseruance they should handle holy mysteries. Two things are commonly objected by the Treatisers friends against the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme. First that it is a vaine & idle ceremony of no fruit, and to no purpose. Secondly, that by being significant, and symbollicall, it bringeth a newe worde into the Church. These two objections doe vtterly thwart & overthrow each the other. Against the second, the iudgement of *Caluin* in this conditiō is mainly opposite, who here requireth in the decencie of every ceremony, that it be not without fruit, &c. intimating therby, that such ceremonies, as are not significant, must needs be vaine. Against the first: I am to answere now, & I doubt not but it wil appeare, to be of much fruit, and to very good purpose, if it do admonish vs of these things. And that it so doth, I declare thus.

First it admonisheth vs of modestie, because it is as a watchword, & secret remembrance, to keepe vs frō sin, the grand impugner of modesty, & mother of shame, bringing to minde, whatsoeuer Christ hath wrought, and we

Aug. tract in
Joan. 53.

Psalm 141.

vowed against sin, and so causing that Christian men never want, a most effectual, though a silent Teacher, to avoide whatsoever may deservedly procure shame. And for that cause it is made vpon the forehead, *vbi est quoddammodo sedes verecundie; vt de nomine eius fides non erubescat, &c.* That we should neither be so bashfull, as to be ashamed of that, wherein there is no shame, nor so, *sine fronte* (as the same S. Augustine speaketh in another place) as not to feare that, which is the only deseruer and bringer on of shame.

Secondly, it doth admonish vs of Religion, for those reasons all adged before in the condition. *Sed, etsi solū hoc significat, quod ait Apostolus*, that they that belong to Iesus Christ, haue crucified the flesh, with the lusts, and concupiscences thereof, how great a good turne vvere that alone?

Thirdly, it doeth admonish vs with what obseruance holy things are to be handled, namely with an eie, & due regarde alwaies had, to the easines and familiariry of the Ceremonie, that it be *vicine, hard at hand, and obuiouo*, not far fetcht, as *praphane* ceremonies commonly are, but, *admodum simplex*, & *presentis admonitionis crucis Christi*, as M^r. Bucer in his censure iudgeth this to be.

Againe: this ceremony hath in it also that order which, in M^r. Calvines opinion, S^r. Paule intenderh, because it is done with such moderation in our Church, as may iustly take away al confusion, barbarity, contumacy, troubles, and dissentions, being so reduced to the first institution, as neither too much is ascribed vnto it, as in the manifold superstitions of Poperie: nor too little, or rather nothing at al, as in the confused phantasies of the Anabaptists. But you wil say there are dissentions about this ce-

remonie in our Church, true, but in whome is the fault? not in our Church, that by the order of this Ceremonie, would take away al confusion, tumult, and dissention: but in thole turbulent men, who will neither admitt, *ut qui presunt, regulam ac legem bene regendi nonerint, aut plebs qua regitur, ad obedientiam Dei, rectamq, disciplinam assuescat*, which is the first thing required in order: nor suffer, *ut bene composito Ecclesie statu, paci et tranquillitati consulatur*, which is the second. And these be the true causes, why they cannot content them selues with the good order of this Ceremonie, but would haue *Novelties*, and alterations brought into our Church. But I leave them to be better advised by the good counsell, and eardned iudgment of *M^r Butler*. * *Ad illos autē qui offenduntur*, ynto such as be offended; because some vluall rites are yet retained, we may well answere, that if they would but consider, howe neither discipline, nor order can be preserved in the Church; without some Ceremonies, this might suffice to satisfie them: For if we grant that, which cannot be denied, that it is behoueful, for some Ceremonies to be, it is then a necessarie consequent, that vluall Ceremonies, (which we may well vse, cannot be reprehended, even for that sole antiquitie, which doth procure thē rather authority, thē reproofe with all men that be carefull to continue the quietnes of publicke peace, and feare to be taxed for leuitie, and affected novelties, which, al together, as much as possibly it may, ought to be auoided, in the propagation of true doctrine.

*Baces. de ordin.
Minist Eccle. in
Ang. ca. penult.*

Lastly, this ceremony of the Crosse in Baptisme, hath in it al those other conditions both negative, and affirmative, that *M^r. Calvin* requireth in laudable Ceremonies.

First *negative*, it is not thought necessary vnto *saluation*, nor in that respect to *binde the conscience*. Secondly, it is not receiued with any opinion of *diuine worship* thereto belonging. *Affirmative*, it is accompanied with that *gravity*, that is required in al honest actions. Thirdly, it is *reuerend*, and may both procure a venerable regarde to the mysterie, and also bee a helpe to stirre vs vp to *pietie*. Fourthly, it tendeth to *edification*. And lastly, that it may want no complement, it hath his *generall* foundation in the *Scriptures*. And therefore by these rules of M^r. *Calvin*, may be wel said to be both a *diuine*, and *humane constitution*. *Diuine*, because it is founded vpon S. *Pauls* general direction, *Let all things be done decently & in order*. *Humane*, because the continual use and practise of the Church, hath alwaies thought this *consignation* of the Crosse in Baptisme, one of those Ceremonies that are performed with decencie and order, & therefore iudged this *particular*, to be fitly deduced out of that *generall*.

Secondly, that the signe of the Crosse is *become an Idoll*. And herein lurketh, the whole deceit of the Treasurers Sophisme, who because it is confessed, that the Crosse hath beene abused among the Papists, and vvorshipped, *culta latría*, as himselfe afterward sheweth, would therevpon inferre, that therefore the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, cannot be wel vsed by vs Protestants. Our answer therefore in few words is this; If he meane that the Crosse is *become an Idoll*, in the Church of Rome, we grant it. But what is that to vs? If hee meane that the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, is *become an Idoll* in the Church of England, we deny it: & then to what purpose is this Treatise? For whereas he would make our Crosse in Baptisme, the same that it is in the Church of Rome, both

both in *name*, and in *forme*, and in *religious*, though not *Idolatrous* vse, as he speaketh, It wil appeare vpo due examination to be vtterly vntrue. For to graunt that they are the same *in name* (for they are both called Crosse: & in *forme* (for they are both crosse lines drawn in the aire, and yet I must tell the Treatiser, that *their* vsing manie Crosse in the same thing, doth *diuersificare forma*, make the forme diuers from vs that vse but one) yet the religious vse of them is notoriously different. For *first*, they giue vnto *their Crosse* *diuine power*, and vertue, as if it could *sanctifie* things crossed therewith, drive away Diuels, heale infirmities, & sence vs from all manner of danger: we ascribe *no such vertue or power* vnto *ours*. Secondly, they yeeld vnto *their Crosse*, abilitie to *merite* pardon for *veniall sinnes*, to convert sinners, and to giue saluatiō: we yeelde *no such ability, or efficacie* vnto *ours*. As for their *Idolatrous vse*, whereby they adore and worshippe their *Crosse*, *cultu latrine*, we much more dissent frō them, and are farre frō giving any *adoration*, or either outward or inwarde service vnto *ours*. So as it seemes the Treatiser vvas not wel advised when he said, their crosse & our crosse is the same in religious vse, for neither did hee remember (as I shal tel him hereafter) that we put no religion in the vse of the Crosse, as the Papists doe, but onlie vse it in a religious action: neither I beleue (if hee were wel put to it) could he shewe the difference betweene the *religious vse*, wherein he saith we agree with the Church of Rome, & the *Idolatrous vse*, wherein they differ from vs. For if *Religio* be *veri cultus*, and *Superstitio falsi*, as *Lactantius* distinguisheth, I should thinke that *our vse*, being *veri cultus*, were only religious, and *theirs* beeing nothing else, but *falsi cultus*, were only *Idolatrous*,

Pag. 14.

Lact. 11. 4. c. 28.

trous, and superstitious. But I leaue the fullisting & examining of these points to there proper place. In the meane time I make this obseruation, out of the Treatisers owne mouth, that, contrary to his aimed intent, & purpose in this syllogisme, hee freeth vs frō al Idolatrous vse of the Crosse: whence, against the malignitie of this *Minor* proposition, I gather this Conclusion out of the Treatisers owne words.

That which hath not an Idolatrous vse in our Church, is not an Idoll in our Church.

But the signe of the Crosse hath not an Idolatrous vse in our Church. Ergo.

The signe of the Crosse, is not an Idoll in our Church.

The *Maior* is plaine, for *Idolum*, & *Idololatria* are *Relatiues*, *Posito uno, ponitur et alterum*, For neither can an *Idoll* be, but where *Idolatrous* vse is, neither *Idolatrous* vse, but where an *Idoll* is. The *Minor* is the Treatisers owne proposition, and the truest proposition in his booke, and therefore the *Conclusion* must needs directly followe of the premisses.

The Conclusion.

Ergo, The signe of the Crosse may not lawfully be vsed in the seruice of God.

Answer to the Conclusion.

The Conclufiō of every syllogisme receaueth his virtue and strength of the premisses, which being firme & true, it standeth good, being weake and false, it faileth, & is of no effect. The *Maior* therefore of this syllogisme being false every way, as hath been declared; and the *Minor* being vntruely fitted, and applied, to the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, vsed in our Church, This *Conclusion* striketh without any force, and missing the bodie,

body, lighteth into the aire, and hurteth not. And for any thing in this syllogisme contained, the Crosse may be stil both lawfully and commendably vſed in the ſervice of God. And thus much for anſwere to the maine ſyllogisme, the ground and foundation of this Treatiſe.

The Treatiſe. I. Sect.

The uſe of the Crosse in Baptiſme is not a thing indifferent, but utterly unlawfull, for this reaſon; It is againſt the Apoſtles precept. 1. Joh. 5. 21. Babes keepe your ſelves from Idols.

Anſwere.

From the maine ſyllogisme, the Treatiſer cometh to the prooſe, firſt of his *maior*, and then of his *minor*. For ſo he telleth vs in the margent, and we muſt needes beleue the margent, becauſe it telleth vs ſo in Capital letters. For otherwiſe if we looke vpon the words prefixed immediatly before his prooſe, we ſhal finde a propoſition, that is nether the *Maior* nor the *Minor* of the former ſyllogisme, but a mixture & compoſition of them both, for it hath the tearmes of *unlawfull* vſed in the *Maior*, & of *the Crosse in Baptiſme* vſed in the *Minor*, & of *nothing indifferent*, never yet mentioned in either propoſition. So that leaving that as an *animal amphibion*, and of the two, likelier to be the *Minor*, I rather beleue the Margent then the Text. And that the Treatiſer may in ſome honeſt ſort ſeeme to conclude his fundamental propoſition, I frame his argument after this manner.

Prooſe of the
Maior.

That which is againſt the Apoſtles precept, Babes keepe your ſelves from Idols, may not lawfully be vſed in the ſervice of God.

But the uſe of an Idoll is againſt the Apoſtles precept, Babes keepe your ſelves, &c. Ergo:

The vse of an Idoll is not lawfull in the service of God.

The Maior proposition I grant to be true, but vpon these conditions.

1 That you take the word *against*, in his proper signification, for *contrary* or *opposite* vnto: & not for *prater* besides, or otherwise then the *Apostle* prescribeth, as most of your friends and favorites doe.

2 That herevpon you be not too insolent, and inferre this contrary conclusion, *Ergo*, *Nothing* may be vsed in the service of God, but that which is in the *Apostles* precept. For there are *many things* laudably vsed in Gods service, whereof the *Apostles* haue giuen no precept. For whereas the *Apostle* S^t. *Paul* promised the *Corinthians*, *other things* will I set in order when I come, and yet neuer after disposed, or set in order those *other things*, for ought that appeareth in any of his writings, our vndoubted perswasion is, that both the *Apostles* left *many things* *unordered* and *undisposed*: & also in matters of Ceremonie, belonging to order, decencie, and edification, there is alwaies a power left in the Church, to dispose, & order such things, according to the *several times, places, natures*, and *occasions* of every Church.

To the *Minor* I answer, that the vse of an Idoll, *quatenus* an Idoll, that is, while it is an Idoll, or as long as it retaines the forme, credit, and estimation of an Idoll, is indeede against the *Apostles* precept: but this is no hindrance, why wee may not vse that thing in Gods service, which is now reclaimed from the Idolatrous vse, though we certainly know, that it was sometimes vsed as an Idoll, as before hath bin declared. For those things which are recovered out of the evil vses, wherevnto they were applied, and restored to holy vses in Gods service; *ipso*

ministerio consecrata sancta dicuntur, in eius honore, cui *Aug. in ps. 113*
pro nostra salute inde servitur.

But let vs now see how the Treatise doth first explaine the sentence of S. Iohn in this next section, & afterwarde confirme his explanation in the third.

Treatise. 2. Sect.

For the explanatiō where of two things are to be scanned. First, what is meant by an Idoll. Secondly, howe far we are to keepe our selues from Idolles, An Idoll is, *Quicquid prater Deum diuino colitur honore:* and though some restraine an Idoll, to a visible forme, because it is deuoted, *idō tē eidōs*: yet, as a learned writer obserueth, *Qui de omnibus idololatria generibus acturi sunt, latius nomen Idoli accipiant necesse est. Idoli igitur nomine intelligitur, quicquid homo vel simpliciter vel x^pū sibi extra verum Deum proponit, fingit q^d colendum.* Neither is this spoken without good reason, for nothing is properly an Idoll, quatenus est *visibilis forma*, sed quatenus *religiose colitur*. If therefore it be worshipped, it may be an Idoll, though it be no visible shape: otherwise the worshipping of Angells. & the soules of the iust men, were no Idolatry, seeing these are inuisible spirits. And therefore the signe of the Crosse, if it be religiously worshipped, may proue an Idoll, though it bee, *transiens quiddam*, a thing vanishing in the aire, and no permanent forme. For as that learned Zanchie speaketh, there is, *duplex Idololum*, the one reall, the other, *imaginariū & tantum mente conceptum*. *Zanch. de re-
dempt. li. 1. c. 17*

For answere to the second Question. Men may keepe them selues from Idolls two wayes, viz. a cultu, & ab usu Idoli, from the worship, and from the vse of the Idoll. For the first S. Paule is so strict, that he alloweth not the Christians, so much as to be present in the Temple, at the

Idolatrous feasts, though they did it without any internal opinion, or external action of worshipping the Idoll.

But John in this place doth not speake so much of the worshipping, as the use of the Idoll, for (as Augustine in psal. 113. well obserueth) the Apostle commandeth, ut caueant non tantum a cultu simulacrorum, sed a simulacris ipsis, that they avoid not only the worship of the Images, but also the Images or Idols themselves.

Now the use of an Image or Idoll may be ciuil, or religious: and both of them, publike, or private.

That an Image, euen such an Image as is Idolatrously worshipped, may be made and retained for ciuil respects, of ornament, story, or such like, we make no question, though the tolerating of them in open and publike places, euen extra cultum, be offensive, and turne into a snare, as Geleons Ephod was to his posterity, when it was abused to Idolatry. And vpon this ground we yeeld, that though the Crosse be apparantly an Idoll, yet in Princes hanners, coronations, coyne, Crowne, or any other ciuil respect, it may haue lawfull use. But that any thing of mans deuising, being worshipped as an Idoll, should be used, Religionis ergo, and in the worshiping of God, seemeth directly against S^r. Johns precept. for, how do I keepe my selfe from the Idoll, or, how do I shew my zealous detestation of that filthy Idolatry, when I retaine it, & use it so honorably as in the Temple, in the Sanctuary, in the seruice of God? Which interpretation of this place of S^r. John, the Church of England doth, on the warrant of Tertullian, approve & commend.

Answer

In the explanatiō of the first point, what is meant by an Idoll, I see not any great matter to be dissented in, from the Treatise: only I perceauē not, how by any of these

descriptions: the Crosse may bee made an Idoll: neither in the explanation of his second point, *howe wee are to keepe our selues from the Idoll*, is any thing greatly to bee reprov'd, so long as hee speakerh of keeping our selues, *a cultu Idoli*, from the worshippe of the Idoll: only I must tel him, that those words, which he citeth out of S^r. *Augustines* words, vpon the 113. Psalme, *ut caueant non tantum &c*, either are not S^r. *Augustines* vpon that Psalme, or else my booke and his do disagree. For I haue diligently sought for them, al that Psalme ouer, but cannot finde them: which I do not obserue, as if I tooke exception against the Treatiser: for, *facilis est error*, a man may easely misse in a quotation: or against the words them selues, let them be S^r. *Augustines*, or the Treatisers, or any other mans; and let them forbid both the worshipp, & vse of Idols, as much as they can, we mislike both the one, and the other, as highly as the Treatiser him selfe doth: The things that in this section I take exception vnto, are in those points he deliuereth, *de vsu Idoli*, as:

I These words. *That an Image, even such an Image, as is Idolatrously worshipped, may be made, and retained for ciuill respects of ornament, and such like, there is no question though the tolerating of them, in open and publike places, even extra cultum, be offensive, & turne into a snare, &c.* The first part, *That they may bee made and retained for ciuill respects of ornament or such like*, we easily grant: but those other words, *Though the tolerating of them, bee offensive, & turne into a snare*, sound harsh in mine eares, not only becaule they containe a flat contradictiō to the Treatisers owne words a little after, where he saith, that without doubt, the meaning of the second commande-

ment is, to binde the Church from al such snares, and allurements to sin, and that al occasions & meanes leading thervnto, are likewise prohibited: but especially, because they containe a contradiction to the truth. For *what els* gaue occasion to *Jdolatry* at the first, but the *vaine glory* of men, making *statues*, and *portraits* of their *triumphes*, and for the *memory* of them whom they loued? Which at the first were *civill respects*, but when they came to bee a snare, were no better then *Jdols*. Had the Treatiser well observed the nature of the words, which he here delivere-
 reth, he would haue found, that nothing is *Scandalum*, *offensue*, or a stumbling blocke, til it bee set to make men stumble: nor a *snare*, till it be laid to catch and intangle. Such things are no longer tollerated, then while they re-
 taine their civil respects: if once they become *offensue*, and *snares*, then God commaundeth presently, *Cast up, cast up, prepare the way, take up the stumbling blockes out of the way of my people.*

Ma. 57. 14.

Againe, if this speech of the Treatisers be true, as hee makes no questiō, what reason hath he to be more friendly to an *Image*, even such an image as is *Jdolatrously worshipped*, though &c. then to our Crosse in Baptism, which is neither an *image*, nor *Jdolatrously worshipped*, nor *retained*, *cum opinione cultus*, nor *offensue*, or a *snare* to any, but such as wilbe offended without caule? If either I in this answer, or any other of the *conformable Cleargie*, should suffer this, or such a like speech to fall from vs, we straightway should be reckoned Antichristian, and Popish, and favourers of *Jdolatry*: but our Treatiser, & his friends, may say what they wil, and yet alwaies bee com-
 mended.

The next words immediatly following are as lavish as
 the

the former. Upon this ground wee yeelde, that though the Crosse bee apparantly an Idoll, yet in Princes Banners, &c. First, your ground is weake, as euen now we declared, & then if the Crosse be apparantly an Idoll, neither Princes Banners, nor Crowne, nor Coine, nor any other ciuill respect, can make it haue a lawfull vse. Your perpetual arguing from *secundum quid ad simpliciter*, doth bewray an exceeding desire to deceiue both others, and your selfe. For, be it granted, that the Crosse is an Idoll *secundū quid*, that is, according to the vse of the Church of Rome, will you thence conclude *simpliciter*, that therefore the Crosse, among whom, and wheresoever, and vsed howsoever, is apparantly, & *simply* an Idoll? who teach not the childishnesse of this caption?

3 The third speech argueth the Treatiser to bee both iniurious, and malicious. *Iniurious*, in that he saith, that the Crosse, a thing of mans deuising, being worshipped as an Idoll, is vsed by vs in the worship of God; for neither vse we that thing, which is worshipped as an Idoll, because there is nothing like between our Crosse, & their Crosse but the name only, as is before declared in the answer to the *minor*: neither do we vse the Crosse, as a thing to worship God thereby, but only as a thing to put vs in remembrance of our duty. *Malicious*, in that he saith, it is vsed by vs, *Religionis ergo*, for *Religionis ergo* in this place, is the same phrase with *Religionis causa* afterwards: And in my vnderstanding is properly Englished, for the *Religions sake*, or *because of the Religion*, that we suppose to bee in it: and therefore the Treatiser doth but double, and dissemble, when he translateth *Religionis ergo*, to retaine it, and vse it, so honorably as in the Temple, in the Sanctuary, in the service of God. For out of what Authors can he shew,

shew, that to vse a thing, *Religionis ergo*, signifieth to vse a thing in the outward seruice of God the Treasurer knows well enough, that these speeches differ, & beare not the same meaning: and yet is content to fatten vpon vs, that we vse the Crosse *Religionis ergo*, which is a most malicious calumniaion. And I must tel him the more plainly of this iuggling, because he vseth it very much, and thinks it a fit bait to catch the simple. True it is, we vse the signe of the Crosse, in a religious action, namely in Baptisme, but we vse it not *Religionis ergo*, with anie conceipt or opinion of Religion, that we ascribe vnto it; and this I giue the Reader as a perpetual caveat, against the grand imposture of the Treasurer. In vaine therefore is that which he addeth of the Church of England, approving & commending of Tertullians interpretation of this place of Iohn, worthely it is approved, and commended, as most fit and agreeable therevnto. Tertullian never meant those words against the sign of the Crosse in Baptisme, of which he alwaies speaketh most honorably: neither doth the Church of England in that Homily, otherwise apply his testimony, then to the detestation both of the service or worshipping, and also of the very shapés and likenes of the Images or Idols themselves, his wordes there, are *effigies & imago* as the same Homily doth well obserue. Our Crosse is neither of them both.

Treatise. 3. Sect.

And this point is further strengthened by the seconde commandement, which forbiddeth not only to worship, but euen to make an Image, or any similitude what soever, so wit ad cultū, or for religious vse, as according to the scripture the best interpreters, partly against Images in Churches, partly on the words of the precept do most naturally expound it.

it. For surely if Idolatry it selfe, as a most execrable thing, be forbidden, then all occasions & meanes leading therunto are likewise prohibited, & what stronger provocation to that spiritual whoredome, the erecting Images, in the place of Gods worship? Plus enim, vt rectè Augustinus in Psalm. 113. valent simulacra ad curuandam infelicem animam, quòd os habent, nares habent, manus habent, pedes habent, quàm ad corrigendam quòd non loquentur, nò videbunt, non audient, non odorabunt, non tractabunt, nò ambulabunt.

And therefore without doubt, the meaning of the commandment is, to binde the Church from all such snares & allurements to sin. And therefore doth Augustine in quest. super Leu. q. 68. wel conclude from this cōmandement, that such making of an Idoll, can never be iust or lawfull.

Now if no similitude at all be tollerable in Gods service, then much lesse any that hath beene, and is worshipped Idolatrouslie.

Tertullian against the Gnosticks, accompted them Idolaters not only which worshipped, but those also which made and retained Images (nempe ad cultum, or for holie use) and in his booke, de Idololatria, hee vehemently reproveh the very makers of Images, though they did not themselves worship the, which sheweth in what execration the Primitiue Churches held any religious use of an Idoll.

The like we may finde in Epiphanius, ad Johannem Episcopum Hierosol. where he reporteth, that finding an Image of Christ or some Saint hanging at a Church dore, he rent it in peeces, avouching, that to hange a picture in the Church of Christ, was contra autoritatem scripturarum, contra religionem Christianam, contrary to the authority of the scriptures, and the Christian Religion.

From hence I conclude, that if the godly fathers were so vehement against the erecting of the Images of Christ, & of Saints, even at that time, before any worship was given unto them: Much more would they withstand it now after men have made Idolls of them. And if they would not suffer an Idoll, so much, as in the place of Gods worship: would they endure themselves to use such an Idoll as the Crosse in the service and sacramentes of God? Their zeale against that spirituall fornication, would neuer permit them so highly to honor such an execrable thing: neither was their zeale herein without ground of knowledge, for the spirit of God in Psal. 115. 8. speaking of Idolls, They (saith he) that make them, are like unto them, and so are all they that trust in them. Where a plaine difference is made betwene makers, and worshippers of Idolls, and both condemned as Cursed transgressors of the Law. Shall any then make the Idoll of the Crosse, & that Religionis cause, and yet be innocent?

Questionlesse by Danids example, we must make no mention, that is, keep no honorable memory of an Idoll, & therefore without doubt, not giue it so much honor as to use it, or the memoriall therof in the house of God, & in his holy worship: but as Isai: saith, we must pollute the reliques, & the very couering and ornament of the Idoll, and cast the away as a menstruous cloth, & say unto it, get thee hence.

Answer.

The Treatiser confirms his explanation of the sentence of St. Iohn by the second Commandement, & by the testimonies of S. Augustine, Tertullia, & Epiphanius therunto applied. Wherin giuing way to his allegatiōs, becaule they are only against Idolatry, and making of Images to worship them, I only marke his scapes, and

overreachings, wherof the first is in these words *Ad cultum*, or for *Religious vse*: where I note, that how loeuer in words, he would faine make *Cultus*, and religious vse differēt things, that so he might seeme to follow his proposed diuision, *de cultu et vsu*, yet in his proofes he makes them both one; A manifest argument, that in all this discourse he neuer commeth nere our vse, of the Crosse in Baptisme, which is so farre from *Cultus*, and *religious vse*, (as he vnderstands it) that we neither worship it, nor suppose any religion to be in it, as I said even now.

A second scape of his, is in this conditionall Collection, vpon the second Commandement, and testiōies of *S^t. Augustine*, *If no similitude at all, be tolerable in Gods seruice, then much lesse any, that hath bin, and is worshiped idolatrously*. For wheras the second Commandement, & all his proofes there vpon, run mainly against *Cultus*, or *religious vse*, (which to him are both one) he cānot thece cōclude, that therefore the vse of some *similitudes*, in a *religious action*, without any worship ascribed vnto them, or *opinion* of religion reposed in them, is not tolerable. For by this *generall restraint*, beyond the nature of his proofes, he may as well exclude the vse of *Sacramēts* out of Gods seruice, which certainly are some kiud of similitudes, of those things which they doe represent: according to that of *S^t. Augustine*, *Si sacramēta quādam similitudinem earū rerum, quārum sunt sacramēta non haberent, omnino sacramēta non essent*. Againe his illation and inference vpon this supposition, is likewise false: for though that were true: yet some thing, that hath bin *heretofore idolatrously* worshiped, may lawfully be tollerated *now*; and some thing that even *now* is *ido-*

Aug. ep. 23. ad Bonifacium.

Latently worshiped, (which yet is not granted of the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, as shall hereafter appeare) may be lawfully tolerated in some other, that are free from all conceite of Idolatrie, as formerly hath bin declared.

Thirdly, hee over-reacheth in his collection vpon the words of Tertullian and Epiphanius, where hee asketh, would they endure themselves to vse such an Idoll as the Crosse, in the service and Sacraments of God? We answer, they would, such an Idoll, as our Crosse is: And we are perswaded that both they, & S^r. Augustine too, would like it wel enough. When they shoulde perceiue, that without opinion of superstition, or efficacie ascribed vnto it, it were reclaimed to the very same symbolisall or ceremoni-
all vse, it had in their times; howsoever in the times be-
tweene them, and vs, it hath bin abused by some to Idola-
trie. Epiphanius misliketh it not in his time, as may ap-
peare in that narration he maketh of Iosephus. Tertullian,
we are sure, would indure it wel enough, who so often &
willingly mentioneth it, and in all his writings commen-
deth the vse of it, *Ad omnem progressum atq; promotion, ad
omnem aditum & exitum, ad vestitum & calceatum, ad la-
vacra, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubicula, ad sedilia, qua-
cunq; nos cōuersatio exercet. frontem crucis signaculo ter-
minas.* In somuch that T. C. pronounceth (tull rashly &
without a cause) that the Lorde left a marke of his curle
vpon it, for coming out of the forge of mans braine, &
being so much abused. And for S^r. Augustines opinion
I refer you to his hundred eighty & one sermon, *de tem-
pore*, or if that please you not, to his sermon *de verbis do-
mini*, where hee saith. *Quod ipse honoraturus erat fideles
suos in fine huius seculi, prius honoravit crucē in hoc sa-
culo,*

Epiph. lib. 10. 2.
contra haeres.
Ebionis.

Tertull. de coron.
mil. cap. 3.

T. C. lib. 1.

Aug. serm. 181.
de temp.

Aug. ser. de ver-
bis domini.

culo, &c. Quod cum magna Insultatione persecutores Iudei Domino procurarunt, cum magna fiducia serui eius, etiam & reges in fronte nunc portant. And yet notwithstanding al this, we are as well, and better perswaded of their vehemeney against erecting of images, and of their zeale against spirituall fornication, then the Treatiser is, & can more easily be induced to beleue, that their zeale herein was not without knowledge, then these men can so slenderly acquaint themselves with their knowledge, or zeale: and as in this: so in all other pointes, never cite any testimonie out of them sincerely, and according to their meaning.

*Fourthly, the Treatiser much overlasheth; where hee marshals vs among the worshipers of Idols, Concluding that streine of his with this forcible words, shal any then make an Idoll of the Crosse? and that Religionis causa, and yet be innocēt? True it is. The prophet David saith. They that make them are like vnto them, &c. but what? is his meaning that they are like vnto them for simply making them? I trust no: for then how wil you iustifie your former words? that an Image may be made and retained for Ciuil respects, we make no question: His meaning is this, They that make them to worship them, and to put their trust in them, as all Idolatrous makers doe, are like vnto them, we make the Crosse indeed, but neither to worship it nor to put our trust in it: And therefore I hope are no more to be Condemned as cursed Transgressors of the Law, then you are when you write the letters, of T. C. name, which you cannot do but you must needs make a Crosse. And I think verily, that you put more religion in this T. then our Church doth in the signe of the Crosse. As for your *Crābe of Religionis causa*, it is answered before,*

Wisd. 13. 17.

fore, and is an odious imputation, by you fastened on our Church, without all colour of truth.

Treatise. 4. Sect.

Now if any doubt, whether the signe of the Crosse be adored: & so made an Idoll: let him well consider the tract of Bellarmine, de adoratione crucis, where distinguishing the Crosse on which Christ was hanged, from the similitude thereof, he saith, ceteræ cruces illi similes, inter sacras imagines numerantur. And after he distinguisheth those similitudes of Christs Crosse, into the Image, & signe of the Crosse, so that if the Image of the Crosse bee taken for an Idoll, (& who knoweth not that it is the universall Idoll of Popery, & to be adored, even cultu latriæ, which worship, as they themselves holde, is due only unto God,) the signe of the Crosse must needs be taken for no better. Besides, the same Bellarmine having, as is said, distinguished the crosse into three sorts, the true Crosse, the image of the Crosse, and the signe of the Crosse, he laieth downe this doctrine generally of them all, omnes cruces adoramus, and particularly of the signe of the Crosse hee saith, signum crucis quod in fronte, vel in aere pingitur, esse sacrû & venerabile. To this agreeth Põtifõrmus Sarilb. 4. where it is thus professed, adoramus crucis signaculum, per quod salutis sum: p̃simus sacramentum.

And that the Image, & signe of the Crosse, is of one, & the same accompt with Papiſtes, appeareth evidently, as by diverse, so particularly by Hart. For Doctor Raynolds, shewing that the Church of Englande, hath iustly left the signe of the Crosse out of the supper, for the Idolatry thereof, doth prove that it is worshipped as an Idoll, by such testimonies, as indeede belong to the image of the Crosse, which Hart no way excepted against, doth imply, that looke what

estima-

De Imag. li. 30

De Imag. lib. 2
cap. 29.

Confer. with
Hart. cap. 8. di-
vis. 4. pag. 509.

estimatio they haue of the Image, the same they haue of the
 signe: & what honor is due to the one, is due to the other. For
 in very deed they carefully teach, that it is not in regarde of
 the matter, wherein the Crosse is painted, or the colour
 whereby it is shadowed, but only & simply, for the expressing
 of the likenes of Christs Crosse, & for the representing of
 Christ crucified (which the signe performeth as wel as the
 image) that they adore the Crosse with the same honor, that
 is due vnto Christ himselfe: And this no doubt was the
 meaning of Aquinas, when he saith, that every effigies or
 likenes of the Crosse (whereof the signe is one) is to be ado-
 red cultu latriæ: and Costerus doth avouch, that the same
 worship is due to the signe, as belongeth to the very Crosse
 of Christ. Vvhē he saith (though falsly) Christiani, à Chri-
 sti temporibus, semper summa veneratione coluerunt
 ipsum signum dominicæ crucis, & signum crucis, quo se
 quotidie muniunt, Marke that the signe of the Crosse is
 worshipped, summa veneratione, with the highest degree
 of honor, and, as Andradius in expresse words saith, In the
 same māner, that the Image of Christ himselfe is worship-
 ped: then the which, what can be more cleere to prooue, that
 not only the Image, but the signe of the Crosse, is by Papists
 most Idolatrously worshipped?

Andra. Orisod
 explic. lib. 9.
 Bellar. de ima-
 iib. 2. cap. 50.

Th Aquin par
 3. q. 25. artic. 4.

Coster. Euch.
 cap. 11.

Oris. explic.
 lib. 9.

Zanch. de re-
 damp. lib. 1. c. 17

If any say, that to the signe of the Crosse none boweth the
 knee, or vaileth the bonnet, and therefore it is not adored.
 I answer first, that adoration is interne, and externe: and
 the externe adoration is therefore Idolatry, because it pro-
 ceedeth from the interne, as Zanchius very learnedly, and
 largely sheweth.

If a man may invoke to an Angell, or giue any honour
 internal to a creature, shall it not be called Idolatry, except
 he bow outwardly vnto it? How then doeth Paule saie that

coru-

1ph. 3. 6.

Coloss 3. 5.

Mark. 10. 24.

Tim. 6. 19.

Luk. 12. 15.

Phil. 3. 19.

Quæst. disput.

de venial pecc.

Conetousnes is Idolatry? For a rich man doeth not outwardly worship his goods; yet because he giueth vnto it interne confidence, which is due vnto God, it is truly called his Idoll, as vnto the Sardanapali there belly is termed their God: Right so the Papists ascribing to the signe of the Crosse, that honor, & confidence which belongeth to God, doe make it an execrable Idoll, & so most vnfit to stand in the sanctuary, or to be annexed to the holy things of God. For first they ascribe vnto the signe of the Crosse, power & vertue to meritt pardon, at the least for veniall synnes, as appeareth by Tho. Aquinas, Bellarmine, and the Rhemiltes.

Also it is held, to partake of power efficient, and immediately operative, and that to conuert sinners: Marshall de cruce. fol. 114. 115. ye a to gaine saluation, Hosius cōtra Brent: pag. 227. and generally the whole rabble of Romish Doctors, doe teach to put great affiance in this signe, for chasing away diuells, and curing diseases, and sanctifying both man, and other Creatures to the vse of man.

Secondly I say indeed, they doe giue out ward, as well as inward worship to the Crosse. For it is apparant, that they innocate it, in the same māner, that they innocate Saints, when they say. Per crucis hoc signū fugiat procul omne malignum. By this signe of holy Crosse, let euills al flie farr from vs. Againe by the signe of the holy Crosse, from our enemies deliuer vs o Lord our God. Also in another place, victorious Crosse and admyable signe, make vs triumph and ioy in heavenly Courts diuine: yet in praiers, they ioint it with Iesus Christ, as in officio Missæ, is to be seene, where they supplicate, per misericordiam Iesu Christi, per auxilium & signum Crucis, per intercessionem beatæ Mariæ, &c. They couple it also with the bloud of Christ, in these words, defend me Iesu ab omnibus vitijs, malis præ

præteritis, presentibus, & futuris, per signum sanctæ crucis, & per inæstimabile pretium iusti, & pretiosi sanguinis tui. *All which doth most manifestly proue, that among the Papists it is religiously honored, both with inward confidence, and outward reuerence.*

Answer.

Though al that the Treatiser alleadgeth in this sectiō, should be graunted, yet nothing is concluded against our Crosse. For whereas his conclusion should be this, *Ergo. the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, as it is used in the Church of England, is an Idoll,* he bringeth vs only this conclusion, *Ergo. the signe of the Crosse, in the Church of Rome, is an Idoll,* his argument is this.

Whatsoever the Church of Rome doth adore, with diuine honor, & wherunto it yeeldeth both interne cōfidence, & outward worshipp, is an Idoll,

But the Church of Rome doth adore the sign of the Crosse with diuine honor, & yeeldeth vnto it interne cōfidence, & outward worshipp, Ergo.

The signe of the Crosse, in the Church of Rome, is an Idol,

The Maior is false. *Whatsoever the Church of Rome doth adore, &c* For so the bread in the Lords supper, should likewise be an Idoll, because the Church of Rome doth adore it, with diuine honor, and yeeldeth both interne confidence, and outward worshipp therevnto, as is better objected, then answered in the first obiection. Againe, if vnto those words, *whatsoever the Church of Rome doth adore &c. is an Idoll,* you had added those words, *in the Church of Rome,* your Maior had beene true, & we should not haue denied it. But from *secundū quid*, to cōclude *ad simpliciter*, (as you alwaies doe,) is too simple a Conclusiō to deceaue any man, that is but a meane Logician: wee

G

cannot grant

graunt that their is, *eadem ratio urbis et orbis*: nor that that must needs be an Idol in euery place, that the Church of Rome hath made an Idol within *hir owne Iurisdiction*.

Touching the *Minor*, we partly graunt it, and partly denie it: we graunt it, *De signo crucis materiali*, such as were *Crucifixes*, of wood, stone, or mettall, & plaine *Crosses* of all sorts, without the *Image* of Christ. And so we vnderstand all your proofes, two only, excepted, whereof you shal heare our answer by and by. *De signo*, or rather *de consignatione crucis immateriali*, drawen in the aire, or vpon the forehead, without any print remaining, we denie it, and answere to your two proofes. the one out of *Bellarmino*: *Signū crucis quod in fronte, Vel in aere pingitur, est sacrum & venerabile*: the other out of *Costerus*. *Christiani summā veneratione coluerunt signum crucis, quo se quotidie muniunt*. that there is great difference betweene *veneratio*, the word that they vse in those places, and *adoration*, the word that you applie vnto them; The first expressing only a reuerent regard, that they haue of the signe; The other a religious worship, which you say, they yeeld vnto it. I wil not take vpon me their defence, nor iustifie their absurdities, for I willingly acknowledge, that they haue too too superstitiously thought of this *consignation* also, and extended their *summa veneratione*, to the highest degree of superstitious opinion, in ascribing too much power, vertue and efficacy therunto, as you declared in the second place of this Section. But yet I cannot be perswaded, that, *signum sacrum & venerabile*, or *summa veneratione*, as they call it, do signifie *adoration*, with diuine honor, or interne confidence, and out ward worship, as you affirme.

Three things therefore I answere to the *Minor*. First, That

That the *Papists* doe indeed very *superstitiously* deeme, of the *consignation* of the Crosse in Baptisme, that it is of *vertue, force, & efficacy*, which we do vtterly & in plaine tearme deny. Secondly, I suppose that the *Treatiser* will never be able to proue, that the *cōsignatiō* of the Crosse in Baptisme, (evē in the grossest time of *Popery*) was ever made an *Idol*, or had any *divine adoration*, or *interne worship*, or *externe honour* exhibited vnto it. For first, howe could it, the thing ceasing to bee, as soone as ever it was made? and then, who should worship it? The *childe* could not, the *Priest* & *people* reflected rather their devotion to their *materiall* wooden *Crosses*, and *mettall Crucifixes*, which they had ever at hand, then to this *immateriall transient* marke. *Ac certum est, omnes ferè Idololatrias solitos semper fuisse, neq. Deum, vel verum, vel falsum, vel ullam creaturam, externa adoratione colere, & adorare, nisi sub, & in aliquâ figurâ illum representante*, and so farre only holdeth that, which you alleadge out of *Tho. Aquinas*, that every *effigies*, or likenes of the Crosse, is to bee adored, with the same honor, that is due vnto the *Prototypon*: namely, if it be *effigies*, a *materiall* shape or similitude, which remaineth *post opus*, not the *immateriall effigatio*, or signing, that passeth, and leaueth no impression, after the Action. As for your allegations out of *S^c Paule*, that *covetousnes* is *Idolatry*, and that vnto the *Sardanapali*, *their belly is their God*, the comparison is not equal. For the *divine honor*, that you conceiue to be founded in *consignatione crucis*, is grouded only vpon a thing *transient*, & *imaginary*, but contrarywise, the *Idolatry* of the *covetous man*, and *felicity* of the *belly-god*, are both founded in *materiali obiecto*, vpon a *reall*, & not vpon an *imaginary* foundation; *Avarus tribuit thesauris suis quod*

*Zanch de re-
demp. li. 1. c. 17*

*Tho. Aqu. p. 3.
25. 4. cap.*

*Eph. 5. 6.
Coll. 3. 5.
Phil 3. 19.*

*Zanch. de redē-
lib. 1. cap. 17.*

proprium est Dei, & Sardanapalus sagina suam felicitatem.

Thirdly, I affirme, that though *Poperie* hath esteemed superstitiously of the *Crosse* in Baptisme, which wee confesse, and given *divine honor* vnto it, which we thinke may very probably be denied: yet our *consignation* in Baptisme, is altogether different from theirs, as before hath bin declared in the answer to the *Minor* of the maine *Syllogisme*.

Treatise. 5. Sect.

And therefore if their *Idols*, may in no sort be annexed to the service of our God, the *Crosse* in Baptisme ought necessarily, to be crossed, and cursed out of our *Leiturgie*.

Answer.

This is that, you haue all this while houered about, & yet can finde no fit *Medius terminus* to conclude. For how wil these two *propositions* hang together?

The signe of the *Crosse* in the Church of Rome is an *Idol*, (which hath bin the only thing you haue proved in the former section.) Ergo:

The *consignation* of the *Crosse* in Baptisme, used in the Church of England, must needs be crossed and cursed out of our *Leiturgie*?

You vndertake to leap too far at once, there are many banks in your way: you must proue, first that the signe of the *Crosse* in Baptisme, in the Church of Rome, is an *Idoll*, which is not granted. Secondly, you must proue, that our *Crosse*, and their *Crosse* in Baptisme is al one, in number, nature, use & estimation: you must lastly proue, that we may not lawfully redceme, an ancient Ceremony, out of his abuse, nor restore him, to his auncient lawfull use againe: al which, I feare, or any of them, wil be too hard a taske

raske for you to vndertake, but your present argument is this.

The Idoll of the Church of Rome, may in no sort bee annexed to the service of our God, but must be crossed, & cursed out of our Leiturgie.

But the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, is an Idoll of the Church of Rome. Ergo:

The consignation of the Crosse in Baptisme, in the Church of England, must be crossed and cursed out of our Leiturgie.

The *Maior* is granted. The *Minor* is denied; for first, as was saide before, you will not bee able to proue, that their immateriall consignation with the Crosse in Baptisme, was ever made an Idoll: and if you chance so to do, yet sure I am you wil never proue, our consignation of the Crosse in Baptisme, to haue bin an Idoll of the Church of Rome; your conclusion therfore, and your premisses are so farre a lunder, that they wil never bee reconciled. It seemes your crossing and cursing hath lighted vpon your owne conclusions, they are so cursedly crossed, and crossedly cursed, that they conclude nothing plainelie and directlie.

Treatise. 6. Sect.

Neither is it sufficient to say that the Crosse amongst vs, is neq; numero, neq; vsu, the same that theirs is, and though theirs be an Idoll, yet ours is not. For when God commanded his people, to breake downe the Images of the heathen, and to extinguish the very name of the, had they performed that charge, if they had burnt all the Idols of Canaan, and afterward made new of the same forme, and to another vse, though not Idolatrous, yet religious? Or how haue we discharged our duties, and shewed our detestation

of that filthy Idolatry, if having defaced al the Popish Crucifixes, and Idols, we erect them new in our Church, though not to worship them, yet to any other holy use what soever?

Answer.

If this be not a sufficient answer, then you may make it more sufficient by adding *neg. estimatione, neg. opinione religionis*, as hath beene taught you before; But why is this reason vn sufficient? Your reason is, *For when God commanded, &c.* To your first demaunde I answer, no. And yet that toucheth vs not. The things compared are nothing like. They should haue destroyed the *olde Idols*, and not haue made *new*: we make no *newe Idoll*, but restore an ancient Ceremony of the church, to his *first integrity*: which we take we may lawfully doe.

To your second I answer likewise, That we erect no new Popish Crucifixes, and Idols in our Church, but restore an *ancient constitution* of the Church, to the reuerend use of the *consignation* of the Crosse in Baptisme: Not to worship it, nor yet to ascribe *virtue* vnto it, as you would suggest, but to be a Ceremony of Decency, & Order, agreeable to so holy, and religious a Sacrament.

Treatise. 7. Sect.

It is true, that our Crosse, and theirs is the same both in name, & forme, but not in use, for then were it Idolatrous; Now I doe not say that the Church of England doth commit Idolatry: but that it ought to abstaine, not only from the Idolatry, or worship, but even from all religious use, of such humane ordinances, and inventions, which others haue, & doe Idolatrously adore, For, if to erect Crucifixes, and other Popish Images for holy use, be (contrary to the Commandement) a keeping of an honorable memory of the Idoll, how can the religious use of the Crosse in Baptisme, being as well

well an Idoll, as any of their Images, be reteined without breach of the Law: Babes keep your selues from Idols?

Answer.

It is true, that our Crosse & theirs is the same in name, but neither in forme, nor religious vse altogether. I saie altogether, because in some religious vse, ours and theirs is the same: namely in this, that both they, and wee vse it for an outwarde Ceremony, to testifie that the childe shall not be ashamed, to confesse the faith of Christ crucified: their superstitious vse we admit not, and their Idolatrous vse (which I wonder how you doe distinguish from their superstitious vse) you free vs from. But you say, we ought to abstaine, not only from the Idolatry, or worship, but even from all religious vse, of such humane ordināces, as others doe Idolatrously adore. From the Idolatrie I confesse, but not from that religious vse which is good, and tendeth to a good end. That it is a humane ordinance, hindereth not, because being withal, an Ecclesiasticall Constitution, it is thereby made in part diuine. That they vse it some way superstitiously, is no reason, why we should not cōcur with them in that wherein they vse it wel. For, *Qui s-* Aug. de doct. *quis bonus, verusq; Christianus est, Domini sui esse intel-* christ. li. 2. c. 10. *ligit, ubicunq; inuenerit, veritatem.*

The erecting of Crucifixes, and other Popish Images, for holy vse, is indeede a keeping of an honorable memory of the Idoll, & yet the wel vsing of the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, in our Church, is not so. For neither doth our Church propose it as an Idoll, but as a Ceremony of decency, and Order, fit for a sacred Action: neither doth it propose it as a remembrance of Popish Idolatry, as you would imply, but as an outward testimony of our profession, and as a memoratiue signe, to put vs in minde of our Christian due-

duetie: which may make vs rather detest, then religiously remeber the abuses of *Poperie*. And therefore neither is it aswell an *Idol*, as any of their *Images*, which you will not proue in hast: nor a *breach* of the *Apostles exhortation*, *Babes keepe your selues from Idols*.

Now we come to the *third* general part of this Treatise, wherein the Treatiser endeuoreth to answer certaine objections of ours, in defence of the *Crosse*: Our *first objection* he letteth downe in these words.

The first objection. 8. Sect.

The signe of the Crosse in the first institution was free from superstition and Idolatrie: and if the abuse which grew after be remoued, why should it not recouer his ancient vse, and indifferency, like as the bread in the Lords supper, which the Papists do religiously adore?

The Treatisers answer to the objection.

There is great difference &c.

I expected the Treatiser in his answer to our objections, framed by him selfe, would haue made every thinge plaine and euident: so as a man at the first sight, might perceau the answer fitted and applied to the *objection* in every point: But some thing there was: either hast, or Ignorance, not knowing how to answer, or *Conscientia fraudis*, or I knowe not what, that would not suffer him to speake directly, nor to exemplifie his allegations, but make him wind him selfe every way, and so to double, & huddle things together, that my selfe I confesse, and I beleene few men else, can find in him, *Quid cui respondeatur*, what is answered vnto which; as to any man that diligently marketh, what he saith to the *first objection*, may plainly appeare. By which meanes, though he hath put me to a double labour, yet I will endeuor in my Replie, both

both to fit his *answers* to the *objection*, and make them stronger; so, that the indifferent Reader shall perceave, that no wrong is offered him; and yet with all I wil so discover his shifts, & windings, as alme I hope, that come not with that obstinate resolution of, *Non persuadabis etiamsi persuaseris*, shall rest fully satisfied, & contented. Now therefore to his answer.

His answer consisteth of *three parts*. The *first* wherof is of those differences, which are betweene that, which God hath *created*, and *commanded*, and that which man hath *ordained*: whereby he would implice, as I take it, that the reason is not like, why the Crosse recovered out of the abuse, should returne to his *ancient integrity*; & why the bread in the *Lords supper*, reclaimed from *Popish adoration* should be againe restored to his *right use*.

The *second* part of his answer, is of a *double use* of the Crosse: *Civill* and *Religious*, whereby he would imply, as I thinke, that the *civill use* may be restored to his *ancient indifferency*, but the *religious use* cannot.

The *third* part of his answer, is concerning our *abusing* of the sign of the Crosse, in the Church of *England*, who, he saith, retaine it among vs with *opinion* very *superstitions*, and *erroneous*; and use it otherwise, then the *ancient fathers* did: Each of these I will consider by it selfe, in their severall order: The *first* therefore hee delivereth in these words.

Treatisers answer to the 1. Obiect.

There is great difference betweene that which God hath created, and commanded, and that which Man hath ordained; for the one is necessary, and no abuse can alter the nature of it; the other indifferent, and by abuse may become unlawfull: and therefore Hereticks did worthily breake

the brazen Serpent, not seeking to redresse the abuse of it: Nowe howsoever Bellarmine woulde insinuate, that the Crosse is founded on Scripture, yet the weaknes of his arguments, doe bewray the vnfoundnes of the matter; & therefore Tertullians iudgment is to be preferred, which plainly saith, that there is no warrant in Scripture for it; Horum inquit, si legem postules, scripturam nullam inuenies, traditio tibi prætenditur auctrix, consuetudo confirmatrix, fides observatrix.

De coron. viii.

Replie to the Treatisers answer.

Here Joblerue, first your assertion, that there is great difference, betweene that which God hath created, & commanded, and that which man hath ordained.

Secondly, your prooffe of this difference, by these particulars.

1 That which God hath commanded is necessary, as the bread in the supper, of this nature ate Churches, Pulpits, &c. things of necessarie use, and warranted by God himselfe.

That which man hath ordained is indifferent, as the Crosse in Baptisme.

2 No abuse can alter the nature of that, which God hath commanded, and is necessary: as the bread in the supper, Churches, Pulpits, &c. That which man hath ordained, and is indifferent, may by abuse become unlawful, as the retaining the brazen Serpent, which was nowhere commanded.

3 That which God hath commanded, is warranted by the scriptures.

That which man hath ordained, is not warranted in the scripture.

For howsoever Bellarmine would insinuate, &c. yet you

you preferre *Tertullians* iudgement, who ſaith, *Traditio tibi præſentatur auctoritas, &c.*

It this bee not your meaning, in the *fiſt* part of your anſwere, I confeſſe, I cannot attaine vnto it: your words are ſo intricate, & doubtfully let downe; which hath cauſed me to vſe the helpe of your *margent*, for the better vnderſtanding of your *text*.

For replie therfore vnto this your *aſſertion*, we willingly acknowledg, that there is indeed great difference, betwene that which God hath created, & commanded: and that which *man*, as *man*, hath ordained: for the *fiſt* proceedeth frō the clear fountaine of al goodnes, wiſdōe, and truth: the *laſter* from the corrupt fountaine of mans hart; wherein *naturally* is nothing, but wickednes ignorāce, and falſhood: But if you make your *compariſon*, betwene that which God hath commanded, & that which the Church of God hath ordained, (as in reaſon you ought to doe) the difference is not ſo great, as you would haue it; Let Gods *commandement* haue worthely the *fiſt* place, and preheminance in al things, as is meete; but let the *ordinances* of the Church, be immediately ſubordinate vnto Gods *commandement*, and ranged in a ſecond place: not only becauſe the Church of God heareth his voice; but alſo becauſe ſhe is ruled by his ſpirit: and by the great, and precious *promiſes* of God, is made partaker of the diuine nature; which no doubt doth aſſiſt them, euen in the *lawes* alſo, and *conſtitutions*, which are made for Order & Decency in the Church.

Concerning your *fiſt* prooſe, & point of difference, when you ſay, That which God hath commanded is neceſſary, that which man ordained is indifferent; I grant, that which God hath commanded is indeed neceſſary, for the

Beza ep. 2. circa
mod.

matter, and necessarie for the forme: (wherein yet looke vpon the second Epistle of M^r. Beza. How far it is necessarie to be done as he hath commanded:) necessarie to be reclaimed from all abuses, that it hath bin subiect vnto: and necessarie to be restored to his first and true use. But before we grant you your second proposition. That which man hath ordained is indifferent: we must be instructed, what you meane by this worde indifferent: for if you vnderstand, the things them selues, as they are of them selues, we grant that the Church cannot make a thing indifferent, to be of it selfe, other then a thing indifferent: but if you vnderstand the same things, as they are for use, lawfully commanded, or forbidden, by the authority of the Church, then we must tel you, that it is not freely in your owne power, and liberty, whether you will use them, or not use them accordingly: for then they cease to be altogether indifferent, & beginn to become some way necessary: which that you may the rather beleeue, I will direct you to M^r. Bezaes 24. Epistle, where you may learne it.

Beza ep. 24. ad
3. 6. 7. & 8.

Res aliqui per se mediae (saith he) mutant quodammodo naturam, cum aliquo legitimo mandato, vel praecipiantur, vel prohibentur; quia neq; contra iustum preceptum omitti possunt, si praecipiantur, neq; contra interdictum fieri, si prohibeantur.

Things otherwise of them selues indifferent, change their nature after a sort, when they are either comanded, or forbidden, by anie lawfull authority: because they can neither be omitted, contrary to the iust precept, if they be commanded; nor done contrary to the prohibition, if they be forbidden. And a litle after.

Ibid. m. 9.

Nam et si conscientias proprie solus Deus ligat: tamen quatenus Ecclesia, ordinis & decori, adeoq; edificationis rationem

*tionem habens, leges aliquas de rebus medijs ritè condit, e-
iusmodi leges pjs omnibus sunt obseruanda, & eatenus cō-
scientias ligant, ut nemo sciens & prudens, rebellandi a-
nimo, possit absq; peccato, vel facere quæ ita prohibentur,
vel omittere quæ sic præcipiuntur.*

For though God only doth properly bind the consciences:
yet so far forth as the Church, hauing regard of order, de-
cency, and edification, maketh rightly any lawes, cōcern-
ing things indifferent: thole lawes are to be obserued, by
al godly men, and so far bind the consciences, that no man
wittingly, and willingly, with a purpose of rebelling, may
without sinne, either doe those things which are so forbid-
den, or omit those things, which are so commanded.

I pray you M^r Treasurer, marke diligently the words,
*conscientias ligant, or, nemo sciens & prudens rebellandi
animo, possit absq; peccato:* for you knowe how many of
your brethren, are forgetfull of this instruction: without
sinne, say you, what sinne I pray you? I referre you for an-
swere to an other. *Qui violat Ecclesiasticam politiam, pec-
cat multis modis: primum enim reus fit violati ordinis in
Ecclesia: deinde auctoritatem Magistratus contemnit: tū
infirmorum conscientias vulnerat: postremò nocet exem-
plo: & charitatem erga fratres violat.*

*Hemmingius
in Synag. cap.
de adiphonū. 9*

He that breakes the Ecclesiasticall Politie, sinneth ma-
ny waies: first hee is guilty of breaking the orders of the
Church: secondly he contemneth the authority of the Ma-
gistrates: thirdly, hee woundeth the consciences of the
weake: and lastly he burseth by example, & violateth the
law of Charitie.

Againe whereas speaking of things necessary, in your
margent you giue vs to vnderstād, that of this nature are
Churches, Pulpits, &c. I demand, of what nature? meane

you of the *same nature*, that the *bread in the supper* is? for so the purport of your answer seemeth to imply, that being only urged in the obiection. If this be your meaning, you are very much mistaken: for though *Churches* and *Pulpits*, are very *necessary* in deed, in *their kinde*: yet their *necessity* is not of that *nature*, that the *bread in the supper* is of. For the *bread in the supper*, is *simply*, and *absolutely necessary*, inso much that if there be *no bread*, there is no *Sacrament*: but *Churches*, and *Pulpits* are only *necessarie* for *conveniency*, and *decency*: for I hope, those *Catus antelucani*, *ad canendum Christo & Deo*, meetings in the morning to sing to Christ, and God, as *Tertullian* speaketh, frequented by the *Christians*, in the time of *persecutio*, were grateful vnto God, though not done in *Churches*: and those *verba propositi exhortatoria, ad imitationem honestarum rerum*, words of the *Pavost*, wherewith he exhorted to the imitation of so honest things, vvhich *Iustine Martyr* mentioneth, may be esteemed good *sermons*, though not deliuered out of *Pulpits*. To conclude this point, if *Churches* be of the *same nature* for *necessity*, that the *bread in the supper* is, how hath it of late yeares come to passe, that many of your brotherhoode, in the *freedome* of *Christian religion*, haue made choice of *private houses* for their *sermons*, rather then of *Churches*? & of the end of a *table* in a *Gentlemans parlour*, rather then of a *Pulpit*? These your practises haue made prooffe vnto the world, that *Churches*, and *Pulpits*, howsoever *necessary*, are not yet so *necessary*, even in your owne opinion, as the *bread in the supper*: nor so greatly respected by you, as here you would make vs now beleue.

Your *second* point of difference, betweene things commanded by God, and ordained by man is, *No abuse can alter*

Tert. Apol. 1. 2.

Iust. Mart. Apol. 2. non lodge a sine.

ser the nature of that, which God hath commanded, but that which man hath ordained, may by abuse become unlawful: as the retaining the brazen Serpēt, which you note in the margent, was no where commanded, and therefore Hezechia did worthily breake it, not seeking to redresse the abuse of it.

In the first of these propositions. No abuse can alter the nature of that, which God hath commanded. I confesse I do rather guesse, then wel vnderstand what you meane by altering of the nature: I suppose your meaning to be this, viz. that no abuse fastened by *Papists*, vpon the bread in the supper, can so alter the right vse thereof, but that by the *Orthodox* and right beleeuers, it may againe be reduced to his first integrity: we concur with you in this opinion, & thinke the very same in the signe of the Crosse: No, say you, not so, because that which mā hath ordained may by abuse become unlawfull: this we confesse also, but adde, that by right vse, it may againe also become lawful: for what should hinder it? Because, say you, it is ordained by man. so then the point of difference consisteth in the diversity of the Authors: the bread abused may againe bee rightly vsed, because God is the author of that institution: the Crosse in Baptisme once abused, can never againe be rightly vsed, because man is the ordainer thereof: God and man doe differ, *tanquam creator & creatura*: betweene whom *Christ* being both God and man, is *pius, medius*: betweene God I say, on the one side, & all mankind on the other: but to bring them yet a great deale nearer: God & faithfull man, regenerated by the spirit of God (of which sort is the Church and every true member thereof) doe differ, *tanquam pater & filius*, as the father & the sonne, I will bee a father vnto you, and yee shall bee my sonnes and daughters. *Ier. 3. 1.*

2. Cor. 6. 18.
Eph. 3. 22.

Rom. 8. 7.

daughters, betweene whom Christ in both natures, is, *Mediator*, a mediator, or reconciler, to take away that difference, which was betweene them, and vs, that wee might be the habitation of God by the spirit: So that these, as you see, differ only as relatives, whose difference is, their natural reciprocation, and whose diuersitie is their coninnctio: the one not crossing, but referring it selfe vnto the other: Only God and vnregenerate men, differ, *tanquam hostes*, like opposites, for *ὁ ὁρμησὶς αὐτῶν* that swaieth in them, is enmity with God, as the Apostle teacheth: so that, except you wil say, that vnregenerate and wicked man, is the ordainer of the Crosse, as you doe fallly, when you say it is, the inuention of Antichrist, the man of sin (for by your owne confession, it is more auncient then he) you see there is no such great difference between the bread in the supper, and the Crosse in Baptisme, *ex parte auctoris*, in respect of the authors. The one being the ordinance of God, the other of the Church of God, which heareth his voice, & is guided by his spirit: the one being the ordinance of God, the other of the faithfull, the obedient Children & sons of God: as partly before hath bin declared. I supposed rather, that you would haue made the difference to consist, in the diuersity of the pollutions, which each of them in the time of their abuse had contracted. The bread, a pollution indeed, but easely separable, & remouable from it againe: The Crosse such a pollution, or filth, as afterwards you please to call it, as no water can cleanse it, nor any pretext purifie it, for the holy seruice of Iehoua. But because you vse these florishes, in the next sectio, I wil spare to speake of it, tel I meet you there.

Thirdly you presse vs with the example of Hezekiah. The brasen serpent, say you, though commanded by God him.

himselfe, yet retained without his expresse comādemēt, became an Idoll, and was therefore worthily broken of Hezekiah, not seeking to reforme the abuse, Therefore much more the Crosse in Baptisme, which was ordained by man only, being abused in as high a degree of Idolatry, as the brazen Serpent was, is utterly to be destroyed, without any further redresse.

This is the, *nodus Gordius*, *ἀκρον*, and height of all your objections, your fortresse, and bulwarke, your *Herculeum* & *Acbrileum argumentum*, wherein you repose all your strength and greatest confidence: and therefore I wil endeavour, to to fitt mine answer, to euery point therof, as I trust the indifferent reader, shal eately perceauē your weaknes, euen in the midst of al your strength:

Therefore concerning your comparison, betwene the reformation of Ezechiah, and our Governours, I answer, first in this example, we must put a difference, betweene those things that are common therin and left for example of imitation to other men, and those things which are proper, and peculiar to this action: The things common to all good reformers, and left to others for example of imitation, are these.

First the duty of a King & cheife Magistrate, on whom it lieth to reforme abuses, and without whole authority, no priuat man is to assume that office, vnto himselfe: Rex *Aug. epi. 50. ad*
domino aliter seruit quia homo est, aliter quia etiam et Rex Bonif. comitem.
est: quia homo est, et seruit viuendo fideliter quia etiam Rex,
et seruit, cum ea facit adseruiendum illi, quæ non potest fa-
cere, nisi Rex. which I note the rather to put our Treatiser, and his adherents, in minde of their too much forwardnes, to begin reformation, being but priuat persons, and to put it in practise, without commission. *Nemo hanc* *Eucer. in scriptis.*
antiquitate suis sumis debet, ut dicitur aliquando in *Angel pag. 154.*
ecclesiæ. si sit ad hoc faciendum vocatus, et habeat an *corisacem*

Polphius in
hunc locum.

*toritatem publicam, & consensum Ecclesie, Priuatis homi-
nibus, ut hoc agant, pius et sapiens autor est nemo.* Those
priuat men, that are thus busy, had neither piety nor wis-
dome, to giue the counsell for so doing. Secondly His zeale
in Gods cause, which was most feruent, & such it ought
to be, in al good Gouvernors, and reformers. Thirdly his re-
formation in repressing Idolatry, & taking away the occa-
sion therof. Fourthly that together with his reformatiō, he
ioined instruction, & teaching of the people: for whē hee
saw them to repose a power of healing, in the brasen Ser-
pent, he called it *Nehustan*, & shewing the matter,
taught them that it had no such power in it; and was no-
thing but a lump of brasse: al these things, I doubt not,
but that our reformers proposed vnto themselves, for an
example of reformation.

The things proper to this action, and hauing peculiar
reference, after a sorte, to the person of *Hezekiah* were
first his manner of reformatiō, by breaking the brasen
Serpent in peeces, & utterly annihilating of it: Secondly
the particular motives that might induce him, to this re-
formatiō, namely one inward, being extraordinarily mo-
ued therevnto by the spirit of God, which doth appear in
this, that hee did otherwise reforme it, then his religious
predecessors before him had done. Another outward be-
ing occasioned so to do because *Achaz* his father, had ei-
ther himselte brought this superstitiō into his kingdom, or
else being brought in formerly, by his Predecessors, had by
his example, and authority, ginen great furtherance, and
encouragement thervnto; and therefore, utterly to take a-
way that staine wherwith *Achaz* had stained the house
and stock of *Dauid*, *Hezekiah*, no doubt, was the rather in-
duced to this destroying kind, and manner of reformation.

Now if our predecessors, and Reformers followed him
not,

not, in this manner of reforming, by vtter subuersiō, they had great reason so to do, being men, whom neither the abuses might so particularly concerne, as this did Hezekiah; and knowing moreover, that, *Ad eundem finem multis medijs peruenitur*. Reformation of abuses, & taking away of Jdolatry is the end, and this end may be attained by more waies then on, as either, by

Instructing the people, and teaching them the right use: or by Lawes prohibiting the Jdolatry: or by punishments, either penall, or capitall, vpon the transgressors of the lawes established: or by removing the thing (if it be a materiall thing, as this was) out of the places of resort, into some secluse place, vvhether the people might neither come at it, nor see it, and where without offence it might still be kept, for a monument of Gods mercy: or lastly, if nothing else wil serue, by vtter abolishing, and destroying the thing. Nowe because, of all these waies, hee made choice of that, which he iudged, and which was indeed, the most expedite, and ready way, and withal the surest, that Idolatry might never be cōmitted to it againe; (*Religiosa potestate Deo seruans, cum magna pietatis laude contriuit*) doing God service, with his religious authority, he brake it, and is worthily commended for his piety. *Aug. de ciuit. Dei lib. 10. c. 8.*

If it had seemed good in his iudgement, to haue taken some of the other courtes, as it is likely, David & Asa, & Iehosaphat, and other good kings of Iuda before him did, his cōmendations, as theirs, had bin no whit lesse, though his reformatiō had neither bin so expedite, nor so sure for time to come: for which cause also, that great & famous execution, which K. Henrie the eight did vpon the Monestaries of this land, is likewise commended: yet manie both zealous, and religious professors, could rather haue wished, that so many famous Monuments, erected some-
I 3 time

time to the service of God, but then abused by the wicked and sinfull inhabitants, might stil haue retained the end and punishment haue lighted only on the offenders.

Yea but you will say, where the abuses could not otherwise be redressed; but had it remained stil unbroken, it would stil haue bin a stumbling block, and occasion of Idolatry, there the readiest, and surest way was to be takē: I grant where the abuse could not otherwise be redressed as in the brazen Serpent, &c. but where the abuse may otherwise be redressed, as in the signe of the Crosse, there destruction, & utter subuersion, is not alwaies the best cure. And herein plainely is the difference, betweene the brazen Serpent, and the Crosse. Hezekiah law the abuse of the Serpent; otherwise incurable, for vnto thole daies (saith the scripture) the children of Israel, did burne incense vnto it: vnto those daies, impotteth a long time before, and an inevitable abuse, that had long continued; wherein (as we are in al good reason to conceiue) the former godly kings, David, Asa, and Iehosaphat, who are greatly commēded, for their reformatiōs, had no doubt made triall of al other meanes, and yet experience made prooffe, that by al those it could not be redressed. In which case Hezekiahs course was necessary, and, hoc supposito, the rule of Pope Stephen holdeth. *Per hoc, magna auctoritas ista est habenda in Ecclesia, ut si nonnulli ex predecessores & maioribus nostris, fecerunt aliqua quae illo tempore potuerunt esse sine culpa, & postea vertuntur in errorē & superstitionem: sine tarditate aliqua, & cum magna auctoritate, à posteris destruantur.* For this cause this authority is to be esteemed great, in the Church, that if some of our predecessors, & ancestors, haue done somthings, which at that time, might be without fault, and afterwards are

a King. 18.4.

Dist 63. cap.
Quia Sancta.

tur-

turned into error, and superstition, they may be destroyed by posteritie, without al lingering, and with great authority. Our Church contrarywise perceiveth, by the fruitfull experience, now of almost fifty yeares, that the abuse, of the cōsignatiō of the Crosse in Baptisme, is cureable, where obedient, and conformable Teachers, instruct the people aright & it seemeth further, that this abuse, wold haue bin much more redressed before these daies, had not the Treatiser, and his complices hindered the worke, by their vnttrue slanders, and accusations, both of our Church, as retaining the reliques of Popery, and of the thing, as if it were the marke of the beast, & framed in the forge of Antichrist; which they know to haue bin, a decent Ceremony vsed in the purest age, and by the greatest pillars of the Church, long before any shew of Antichrist did appear.

Againe Janswere, that it is by the Magistrates to bee considered. First, wherein the abuse doth more principally reside; whether in the persons, that do abuse the thing, or in the thing that is abused. For reason would generally, that as by the skilfull Physician, cures are applied to those parts, that are most affected, so by the discreet Magistrate, the redresse should be made there, where the abuse principally consisteth. If in the persons, the easines, or difficulty, of reforming them, is diligently to be respected. If in the thing that is abused, the Magistrate is likewise to consider, of what nature the thing is. If euill of his owne nature, and first institution, as Lupanaria, the stews and such like places be, then without al questiō, their best redresse is, their vtter subversion, and destruction. If good of his owne nature, & first institution, but abused by mō, as both the brazen Serpent, & the sign of the Crosse were: then the consideratiō is, whether the thing thus abused,

be *such*, as may wel be spared, or *such* as cannot wel bee spared. If so, then it is apparantly, the readier, and easier way, to take away the thing. If otherwise, then the wisdō of the Magistrate, wil direct him, rather to take away the *abuse*, then destroy the *thing*. These cōsiderations in the matter of the *brassen Serpēt*, made good king *Hezekiah* to finde, that the *brassen Serpēt* was for one *peculiar time & occasion*, that it had *long before his daies performed that service*, for which it was *erected*, that it belonged not to the people of *his time*, nor had no such cure, as before, to *effect*: That though the *Serpent* were a *type* of the *Messiah*, yet there remained a memory of it in the bookes of *Moses*, that would serue that turne, though this were taken away. Lastly, that it was *allone*, these things considered, whether it were preserved still, or vtterly abolished: vpon which grounds, he proceeded, to that, so much cōmended *execution*, brake it in peeces, and called it, *Nebushtan*. The same deliberations likewise, in our reformers, in the matter of the *Crosse*, made them to find, that the consignation of the *Crosse* in *Baptisme*, was not more peculiar to the times of the *Primitive Church*, then to *ours*: That it had not performed all that service, for the which, it was *first instituted*. That it is an *admonisher*, as necessary now, against *Atheists*, *Mockers*, and *Blasphemers*, as it was at the *first*, against *heathen*, and *Pagan Idolators*. That if it were taken away, the Church of *Rome*, might iustly accule vs, of *abrogating an harmelesse, & innocent institution*, of the *Primitive Church*. That it is not indifferent to our Church, whether it bee taken away, or not: both because we are not to *reiect ancient institutions*, where there is no neede, and also to make knowne to the *Romanists*, that we *willingly reiect nothing*, that *possiblie* may

Non semere,
ne: subinde, nec
levibus de cau-
sis ad novatio-
nem est decurre-
dum. Cuius. Inst.
lib. 4. cap. 10.

may be reduced, to his first integritie. Vpon these grounds and deliberations, our good Magistrates in *K. Edwardes daies*, did not abolish the use of the Crosse in Baptisme. And vpon the same grounds our worthy Prince, & Magistrates, that now are, thinke it meete, to retaine it still. *Quid hic peccatum est?* what offence I pray you is this? or why should not you be as fauourable to our Christian liberty herein, as the most learned Mr. Beza is? *Scio non nullos sublatam crucis adorationem, aliquem signi crucis usum retinuisse; utantur igitur ipsi, sicut par est, sua libertate.*

Beza Respon. ad Franc. Balduin. pag. 227.

I answered thirdly that our Reformers did the same thing, in their reformation, of the Crosse in Baptisme, which Ezekiah did in his reformation of the Brazen Serpent: for what was that which Hezekiah did? surely it was, that he tooke away the abuse, wherein it was faulty, not the right use, wherein it was typicall, and figurative. The abuse wherein it was faulty, was the burning of Incense vnto it, and worshipping of it, & the occasion of this abuse was, that opinion, and estimation of Deity, which the people had fallily affixed vnto it: both the he tooke away; namely the abuse, and the occasion. Our reformers haue done the very same; They haue taken away, first, the abuse of the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme; which was, the too great estimation, and opinion, of grace, power and vertue, that the people erroneously reposed in it: and secondly, the occasion of that abuse; which was the ignorance, and misunderstanding of the people, for want of instruction.

Only the difference is: that the abuse which was the least, in the Idolatrous Iewes; namely their false opinion of Deity in the Serpent, was the greatest in our men, as touching the Crosse: and that which was the greatest in them;

them; namely their *worshipping*, and *burning incense*, vnto the *Serpent*, was none at al in ours, in the *signe* of the *Crosse*. For our men, going as far as they, in ascribing *uer- tue*, which was an *equal fault* in both, could not go so far in *worshipping*, & *adoring*, becaule of the *diuersity* of the *natures*, of the *seueral things*. The *brassen Serpent*, being a *substance materiall*, and *permanent*, and therefore *easily subiect* to *adoration*, by reason of the *outward shape*, and *forme*: The *signe* of the *Crosse* an *action immateriall*, and *transient*, & therefore nothing so *easily*, to be *worshipped*, by reason it wanted both *substance*, *shape*, and *forme*.

Secondly *Hezekiah*, neither tooke away, nor *purposed* to take away, the *right vse* of the *serpent*, wherein it was not *faulty*; namely, that it was a *type*, of *Christs exaltatiō*, on the *Crosse*, and therein a *representation*, of the *Messiah*: This *vse* remained still, after the *reformation* of *Hezekiah*: Neither did our *Gouernors*, take away that *vse*, of the *signe*, of the *Crosse*, wherein it was not *faulty*: Neither did they suppose it *meete*, to take it away: but *restoring* it to that *vse*, for which it was *instituted* at the first, left it stil to be a *memoratiue signe*, of our *promise* made to *Christ* in *Baptisme*, and a *secret*, and *faithfull admonisher* of our *duties*. So that we may safely say, our *Reformers* followed the *reformation* of *Hezekiah*, most *exactly* in al points, wherein the *diuers natures* of the *abuses*, & the *things*, did not make a *necessary difference* of their *reformation*.

Concerning your comparing of the *authors*: The *bra- sen Serpent* commanded by *God*, and the *Crosse* in *Bap- tisme* ordained by *man*, though I haue answered therio before, this now I add moreouer, by way of *retortion*: Though both did giue *occasion* to *Idolatry*, yet the *bra- sen Serpent*, even therefore, becaule it was *ordained* by *God*,

God, might minister a more probable, present, and obviouse fall into Idolatry, then the Crosse in Baptisme, in that it was ordained by man: This I declare thus.

When mens minds are once infected with superstition, they take holde soonest of that, which is most commended by the author: & the more worthy the author is, the more firmly they cleave to that, which they have once fastned their error vppon. if therefore they finde God to be the author of it, they take that for reason sufficient, why they should worship it. This cause made the Idolatrous Iewes, not only to worship the brasen Serpent at the first; but also to thinke, that in so doing they did well; because they worshipped only that, wherof they knewe certainly, God himselfe to be the author. The same reason moued those Idolators, reprobued by the Prophet, to burne incense to the Sunne, and Moone, and all the host of heauen, and to worship the, thinking their Idolatry the more iustificable, because it tooke occasion, not vppon any inuention of man, but vppon those excellent creatures of God, whom hee hath placed so high, and adorned with so great beauty: Contrariwise, the deuises and inuentions of men, such as the Crosse is, are alwayes doubtful, and suspected, euen vnto the Idolators themselues; and haue not their occasion, so present, & immediate, as the other: For first, the Author must haue some reason for his deuile, and then authority, to giue countenance therunto: and lastly, the opinion of the people, approouing the reason, & imbracing the authority. which points being wel considered, as they make a farther way about, to bring the credit of adoration, to that which is inuented by man: so they are good meanes, to perswade the people to forsake their Idolatry: when they haue imbraced it: So that your argument,

ment, from the *diuersity of the Authors*, doth rather make against you, then giue any strength to your cause.

The like may be said of the *opiniō* of vertue, which the Idolor is alwaies willing, to ascribe vnto his *Idoll*. For when it doth manifestly appeare, that that, which he maketh an *Idoll*, is commanded of God, the Illation is farr more present and easy *Ergo*, it cannot be without vertue: then can be applied to any ordinance deuised by man.

Concerning your comparing of the *brazen Serpent*, and the *Crosse* together, wee must confesse, the Idolatrie is like, and worthy to be punished with like extirpation, so long as you cōpare, the material *brazen Serpent*, with the material *Crosse*, of wood, stone, brasse, or anie outward sensible substance. For these having once gottē the opinion of *Deity*, to reside in thē, expose themselues to be adored by the vulgar sort, no lesse, and in no inferiour degree, then the Serpent did. But when you extend your comparison, to match the *immateriall* consignatiō of the *Crosse* in Baptisme, with the *materiall* brazen Serpent, your comparison holdeth not correspondency, as in the former. For there is great difference, betweene this *consignation*, and those other *Crosses*: so that, wherein this is different, from them, therein also it must needs bee different from the brazen Serpēt. From those other *Crosses*, and so consequently, from the brazen Serpent, this consignation of the *Crosse* in Baptisme, doth differ, *First* in *matter*: they *materiall*, and *sensible*, this *immateriall* & *insensible*. *Secondly*, in the *end*, they made perhaps, and framed of purpose to be *receptacles* of *diuine worship*, this only to serue for a *signe* of *remembrance*, being therefore iustly to be reckoned among those things, *Quæ pertinent*

adiutorij & iuvamenti; which belong to *order* and *de-*
centy: Because it admonisheth the rude people of their
Bucer in script.
Angl. pag. 454.
 duty, and calleth men to a remembrance, of that obedi-
 ence, that they owe to God, by a manifest and special sig-
 nification, wherby the Church is edified. *Thirdly*, in the
abuse, they abused in as high a degree of superstition, as
 the Serpent was, this only abused in erroneous opinion,
 and conceipt of *vertue*, and *power*, falsely ascribed vnto it.
 And *fourthly* in *redresse*, they no waies cureable, but by
demolition, this curable by *informing* the vnderstanding
 aright, & teaching the ignorant, that we repose no *power*
 and *vertue* in it, nor yeeld any *diuine worship* vnto it, but
 vie it only as an *admonisher*, & *remembrancer* of our Chri-
 stian duties: and therefore you must not argue, that be-
 cause thole *material Crosse*s were as offensive as the bra-
 sen Serpent, therefore this *immaterial consignatio* must
 needes be so. You shall doe better to distinguish them in
name, calling them, as they are indeede, Crosse, and this
 the *consignation* of the Crosse: then to confound them in
nature, or suffer your selfe to be deceived by the *name*, as
 if what things soeuer agree in *name*, must of necessity a-
 gree in *superstition*, and *idolatry*.

Lastly concerning your marginal note, that God no
 where *commanded* the retaining of the brazen Serpent; we
 answer, neither doth he any where *forbid it*: & I make no
 doubt, but had it not bin abused to superstition, it might
 without offence to God, haue beene retained, though he
 gaue no expresse commandement so to do. And he that
 considers, what great prerogatiues the brazen Serpent
 had, wil (I suppose) be of the same opinion. For it was ere-
 cted, not by *mans*, but by *Gods direct commandement*. It
 was adorned and commended, with a most famous and

memorable *miracle*: It was a monumēt of a very strange and extraordinary *cure*: It had continued a long time, & might almost alleadge *Prescription*, why it should be retained stil: It was a type and figure of *Christs exaltation* on the Crosse, as himselfe expoundeth it: *As Moses lift up the brazen Serpent in the wilderness: so must the sonne of man be lifted up, &c.*

Job. 3. 14.

But what woulde you inferre vpon the not retaining of the brazen Serpent? That we should not retain the vse of the Crosse in Baptisme? But this our Church hath *enjoyed*, and commanded, whose *commandement*, we are bound in *conscience* to obey, so long as it commaundeth nothing *contrary* to the word, & will of God. For howloever you & your consorts reiect obedience, yet we take it not our duties so to doe. Lawes made by the *Church*, of things *indifferent* (as M^r. *Beza* told you a litle before) doe so far binde the conscience, that no man *wittingly*, and *willingly*, and with a purpose of resisting (take heede M^r. Treatiser this clause cōclude not many of your Brotherhood) may *without sin*, either do those things which are so forbidden, or omit those things which are so commanded. *Christiani populi officium est* (saith M^r. *Calvin*) *quæ secundum hunc canonem (in quo charitas moderatrix est) fuerint instituta, &c.* It is the duty of Christiā people to obserue and keepe those lawes that shal be made, according to this rule, (meaning where charity is the Moderatrix as he said before) with a free conscience indeede, and no superstition, but with a godly and readie propension to obedience. Neither must they have them in contempt, nor by carelesse negligence omit them: much lesse through pride and stubbornnesse openly violate and resist the. VVhere, by the way, let it trouble no man,

2 Cor. 13. 14.
ad 5. 6. 7. & 8.
Num. 9.

Calv. Inst. lib.
4. c. 10. par. 6. 31

man, that M^r. Beza saith *conscientias ligant*, M^r. Calvin saith, *libera quidem conscientia*. For M^r. Beza in his binding of the conscience, hath respect vnto the obedience that is due vnto the authority, M^r. Calvin in his freedome of the Conscience, hath reference to that estimation we should haue of the things, not to thinke otherwise of them then of things indifferent, though commanded by authority: to which purpose M^r. Bucer also speaketh, *has etsi seruare & omittere etiam extra scandalum licet, tamen si ex proteruita aut petulantia quis ordinem, publica auctoritate constitutum contemnat & turbet, non leuiter peccat.* These Ceremonies though it be lawful to obserue or omit, where no scandall is offered, yet if any man vpon stowardnes or wantonnes, shal cōtemne, or disquiet the order, that is established by publike authority, he sinneth greiuously. And let this suffice for answere to your example of the *brazen Serpent*, and *second point* of difference.

Bucer in scripto.
Angl. pag. 456

Your *third point* of difference I take to be, The bread in the supper, is warranted in the scripture. The Crosse in Baptisme hath no warrant in the word, For howsoeuer Bel-
larmine would insinuate, &c.

The former of these, That the bread in the supper is warranted in the Scripture, we know right wel: to the latter that the signe of the Crosse is not warranted we answere first, that it is no where in the Scripture forbidden. Secondly, *Non requiritur necessarium, ut in sacris litteris expressam mentionem exhibeamus; singularem rerū quas v-
surpamus.* Thirdly, that though in expresse words it be not warranted, yet *virtualy, fundamentally*, and in *suo principio*, it is even in the Scriptures cōprehended. The principle, and foundation that I meane, is, that generall precept of the Apostle concerning things indifferent. Let

Pei. Mart. in
Ep 4. ad Hopy-
perum.

2 Cor. 14. 40. *all things be done decently and in order*, in the 'generallity wherof this particular is contained, as by the deduction before mentioned in the answer, to the *Minor* of your maine Syllogisme, may plainly appeare; Lastly concerning *Bellarmins* insinuation, that the *Crosse* is grounded &c: we stande not vpon it, nor build our opinion vpon any prooffe of his. Yea, as it is certaine, that the *materiall* *Crosse*, wherupon Christ suffered, was shadowed by the *pole*, wherupon the brasen Serpent was lifted vp (for so our Savior himselfe doth resemble it) so I see not what inconvenience can follow, if we should say with *S^t. Augustine*, and *S^t. Cyprian*, that eue this our *immateriall* *consecration*, did take his first beginning and occasion in the primitive Church, vpon the signing of the Israelites *dore posts*, with the blood of the *Pascall Lambe*: or by the signing of the *that mourne in their foreheads*, with the mark of the letter *T*. or by *Iacobs* blessing of *Ephraim* and *Manasses* with his hands a *crosse*, wherby as *Musculus* obserueth, *Adumbrabatur mysterium Crucis, in quo est omnis vera benedictionis fons & origo*. But al this we yeeld vnto you, and embrace with you *Tertullians* iudgement, that this is established by no other warrant, then by the *authoritie* of the Church, the weight wherof you haue sufficiently hard of before. But now let vs heare the second part of your answer, to our first obiection.

1oh. 3. 14.

Aug. de catech.
radibus cap. 20.
Cyprian ad De-
ces. cap. 19.

Exod. 12. 7.

Ezech. 9. 4.
Gen. 48. 14.

Wolf. Muscul
in Gen. cap. 48.

Treatise. 9. Sect.

Now it is farther to be noted, that a double use of the *Crosse* is mentioned in antiquity one ciuill, & the other religious, against the former wee doe not dispute, yeelding all reverence to those Christians, which by that more shewed their reioicing and glory in that, which the heathen counted their shame. But now, that abuse hath turned the image and signe of the *Crosse*, into an *Idoll*, it seemeth thereby to be made

made execrable. For Gideons Ephod being first a civill monument of victory, when the people went a whoring after it, was it lawfull for the Magistrat, to erect in the Tabernacle or Sinagogue, though not the same yet the like, both in name & forme to any religious use? Would it have sufficed to have said, this is not the same Ephod, that Israel maketh an Idoll of, neither is it set here to bee worshipped (for your brethren doe grievously sin therein) but only to keep in minde the great victorie that God by Gedeon gave to Israell? Right so the Crosse used by the ancients to shew that they were not ashamed of Christ crucified, being merely civill, and yet expressing a most Christian resolution, having bin abused, yea continuing to be worshipped, both in Imagine & in Signo, It seemeth that this filth hath made it unfit, on any pretence of restoring it to his ancient use, to be annexed to the holy things of the Sanctuary. Especially while there are so many Papistes, that superstitiously abuse it among vs. Now for the religious use of the Crosse, by the ancients, it was never free from sin and superstition, as afterwards is shewed, and if it were, yet it being an humane ordinance and now not only abused to Idolatrie, but becoming it selfe a most abominable Idoll, no water can clese it, nor any pretext purifie it, for the holy service of Iehonab

Replie to the second part of the

Treatisers answer.

The Treatisers maine forces are spent already, in the first part of his answer, All these things that follow are nothing else but, *leuss armaturæ milites*, his light horseme and florishes, to make the number of his argumentes seeme the greater. In this Section he telleth vs of a two-fold use of the Crosse mentioned in antiquity, one *Civill*, the other *Religious*. This we acknowledge to be true. The
civill

use was held of the, as a *Trophee*, & publike Monument, of that great victory which God gaue to *Constantine* against *Maxentius*. For which cause *Constantine*, at the first made the signe of the Crosse in his *imperiall banner*, stamped it vpon his *Cosmes*, graued it in his *Statues*, & *Images*, and in the armor of his Soldiers: And the like hath bin vsed by all Christian Princes ever since. Secondly, as an ornament in story, or outward beautifying of any thing: Thirdly, as an outward marke of distinction frō the heathen Idolaters, wherby in their common meetings, and intercourse of life, they made it knowne, as well to the Infidels, as to one another, that they were *Christians*, & no waies ashamed of the Crosse of Christ.

The religious use they made of the Crosse, consisted more privatly, in a mutual reference towards theselues, and was frequented, First in their actions of cōmon life, still to excite their devotion, to admonish them of their duties, and put them in minde of Christ crucified. *Muniantur aures, ne audiant edicta feralia. Muniantur oculi ne videant detestanda simulacra. Muniantur frons, ut signū dei incolume seruetur. Muniantur os, ut dominū suū lingua victrix tueatur:* as *Cyprian* speaketh, *ad omnē progressū atq; promotū*, &c. as *Tertullian* declareth, They vsed to mark their foreheads with the sign of the Crosse, at every moving, and stirring of their bodies, as they went out, as they came home, as they put on their cloathes, pulled on their shooes, and as they washed; at table, and at candle-lighting, going to bed, and sitting downe, & generally in every particular action of their life. Secondly, they vsed the signe of the Crosse, in the Sacramēt of Baptisme, as we doe now, for a present admonition, and memoratiue token, continually to put vs in minde of our duty & profession,

Cyp. ep. ad Thibor. cap. 3.

Tertull. de coron. mil. cap. 3.

fession, which in that Sacrament we vndertake. J haue therefore the more particularly mentioned these differences, that J may the better expresse this point to the vnderstanding of the Reader.

Concerning therefore the *ciuill* vse of the *Crosse*, among the Auncients, the Treatiser deliuereth vs these oracles.

1 That he will not dispute against the *ciuill* vse, & yet he tells vs, that now by *abuse*, it is turned to an *Idoll*.

2 He yeelds *alreuerence* to those Christians, which by that note shewed their reioycing, and glory, in that which the Heathen counted their shame: Yet withall he saith, It is made execrable.

3 He saith, the Auncients, to shew that they were not ashamed of Christ crucified, expressed therby a most Christian resolution: But withal he addeth, By the filth which it hath since contracted, it is made vnfit on any pretence to be restored to his auncient vse, & to be annexed to the holy things of the Sanctuary.

Touching these his speeches, as we willingly embrace that, wherein he commendeth the Auncients, (which is a thing very rare among that generatiō) so we would also free our selues, that tread only in their steps, and vse it no worse then they did, from those imputations of making it an *Idoll*, *execrable*, and a *filth*, which the Treatiser doth lay vpon vs, if not as *Authors*, yet at the least as *Abettors*.

And therefore leauing their *religious* vse, to his place, because the Treatiser speaketh these things only of the *Ciuill* vse: J would faine learne, which of those *Ciuil* vses mentioned before, we haue thus greiuously abused. If he say the *first* vse in *Banners*, *Caines*, *Statues*, *Armor* & *Such*.

such like, or the *second*, in matter of *History*, or outward *ornament*, or beautifying of any thing, himselfe is farre more faulty, then any of vs. For of the former he hath yeelded before, that in Princes *Banners*, *Coronations*, *Coyne*, *Crownes*, or in any other *Ciuill* respect, it may haue a lawful vse: yea, though it be apparantly an *Idoll*. And touching the latter he maketh no question, but that it may be made and retained, though it be of an *Image*, euen such an *Image* as is *Idolatrously* worshipped. Neither can I possibly see, how we haue made an *Idoll*, *ex-ecration* and *filth* of their thirde ciuill vse, wherby they made it a *note of distinction* from the *Infidells*. For that is the very point, for the which, in this place he so commendeth the Auntyents, yeelding al reuerence to those Christians &c. & againe, They haue expressed a most Christiā reolutiō: &c. So that except the Treatiser haue some other *Ciuil uses*, of the Auntyents in store, that we know not of, we cannot be perswaded, that we retaine any *Ciuill* vse of theirs as an *Idoll*, *excecrable*, and a *filth*, either in the *Image*, or in the *signe*.

But yet he proueth it by the example of *Gideons Ephod*. For *Gideons Ephod*, saith hee, being first &c. I take the force of his reason to be this.

That good *ciuill vse* of any thing that is abused, and continueth to be worshipped both *in Imagine*, & *in signo*: is made an *Idoll*, *excecrable*, and a *filth*. This he proueth by the example of *Gideons Ephod*.

But the good *ciuill vse* of the *Crosse* among the Auntyents, is abused & cōtinueth to be worshipped, both *in Imagine et in signo*. This he taketh to be proued by the practise of so many Papists, as do superstitiously abuse it among vs. Ergo,

The good civill vse of the Crosse among the Aun-
tients is made an *Idoll*, execrable, and a filth.

The *maior* I grant to be true, not *simpliciter*, but *secū-
dum quid*: that is, only there, and among them only, that
doe abuse the good civill vse, and continue worshipping
of it, both in *Imagine*, and in *signo*. In them, and to them
it is indeede an *Idoll*, execrable, & a filth. But what is that
to others, that neither abuse it nor worshipping it? To the
cleane, saith the Apostle, *all things are cleane, but to them* Tit. 1. 15.
*that are defiled, and unbeleeving, nothing is cleane, but e-
ven their mindes, & consciences are defiled*. Shall the sins
of one man, thinke you, be laid vpon another? God hath
promised no. *Anima quæ peccaverit ipsa morietur*, The Ezech. 18. 20.
soule that sinneth that shall die; The sonne shal not beare
the iniquity of the father, nether shal the father beare the
iniquity of the sonne. Your perpetuall harping on one
string, frō *secūdum quid*, to *simpliciter*, maketh that your
musicke is nothing pleasant, as I have tolde you often
before.

Touching the prooffe of your *Maior*, by the example
of *Gideons Ephod*, which you say, beeing first a *civill* mo-
nument of victory, &c. Janlwere, that it was *not only* a
civill monument, and therefore your cōparing of it with
the civill vses of the signe of the Crosse, among the An-
cients, is vnfit.

And that it was *not only* a *civill monument*, besides S^c.
Augustines authority, the very *nam*- and *nature* of the *E-
phod*, which he made, doth plainly teach. For what else is Aug. quæst. in
Iudic. quæst. 41
an *Ephod*, but that most glorious & beautifull vpper gar-
ment, which the high Priest ware in the celebration of
divine sacrifices? *Pot uisset carmen ut Barac & Debora cō-* P. Mart. in
l. in locum,
scribere, vel columnas erigere aut quippiam simile. If hee

Gedeon illud E
phod Pōificale
& pretioſum
consecis. Ps.
Mars.

Iudg 8. 27.

August.

intended a civil monument only, why made he choice of an Ephod? If besides the civil remembrance of his victory, he also intended the service of God (as S^c. Augustine iudgeth) thē was it not only for a civil monument. Now that the service of God, was also in his intention, not only the name of an Ephod. *Quo nomine omnia possunt intelligi, quæ constituit Gedeon in sua civitate, velut ad colendū Deum, similia tabernaculo Dei, ea locutione quæ significat à parte totum, propter excellentiam vestis Sacerdotalis,* By which name all things may be vnderstood that Gedeon erected in his citie, as to worship God, like the tabernacle of God, by that manner of speech called *Synecdoche*, which by a part doth signifie the whole, for the excellencie of the Priests garment) but the scripture also seemeth to cōvince. For there it is said, That al Jsrael went a whoring after it. And that it was the destruction of Gedeon & his house. How could it be to his destruction if he meant it not to the service of God?

Gedeons sin then was, not that hee erected a civill monument only, as you saie, but, *Quod extra Dei tabernaculū, fecit aliquid simile, ubi coleretur Deus.* But because without the Tabernacle of God hee made some like thinges, where God should be worshipped: which was plainly against the will of God, who had appointed his worship, to bee frequented no where, but where the Arke of the Covenant was, which at that time was in *Silo*.

2. I say that there is no iust comparison betweene Gedeons Ephod, and the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme. For the end of Gedeons Ephod was, either for Gods service, (& thē it was faulty, as is said before,) & so is not the Crosse with vs: or else (to make the best of it, and to graunt you your owne interpretation) it was, that the memorie of Gods

Gods benefit towards him in his victory, might not be abolished, and then the signe, which hee vled, was not fit, nor agreeable to the matter. For, *Deum non mandauerat in lege, vt fieret Ephod in istum vsu, sed tantum vt sacerdotes cum sacrificaturi essent, illud induerent.* Pet. Mart. in hunc locum. Signo igitur minus dextero. & opportuno vsus est. God did not comande in the law, that an Ephod should bee made to this vse, but only that the Priests should weare it, when they were sacrificing; wherefore hee vled a signe not so commodious, nor so fit. But our signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, is most fit, and natural, and agreeable to the actiō, to signifie the end, which we intende thereby, which is not so much to imprint a memorie of Gods benefire towards vs, as to remember & admonish our selues of that dutie, which in Baptisme wee promised vnto God.

3. To your questiō. *Vvas it lawful for the Magistrate, &c.* I may as wel aske you. Was it not lawful for the Magistrate so to doe? Or if that Ephod were vnlawful, was no Ephod to be vled in Gods service afterwards?

4. As touching, that you say; *The signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, among the Ancients was meere cyvil,* I answer, that you haue heard before, that it was *some* waie religious, though they repoled no religion in it. For those vles that they made of it, To be a signe of their professiō of Christian religion, To bee a token that they were not ashamed of the Crosse of Christ. To be a testimony eue before Idolaters; That they put their hope & cōfidence in Christ crucified; are rather to be counted religious, in my vnderstanding, then *only* and *meere cyvil*, as you conceiue of them.

Your *minor* proposition offendeth in the same capti- on that your *maior* doth. For say that the good civil vse of

allow of yours, nor of your Patriarch T. C. iudgment, Sec. 13. T.C. lib. 1. pag. 170. wherwith he censureth it. *That the Lord hath left a mark of his curse vpon it, wherby it might be perceined to come out of the forge of mans braine &c.* This censure of his is too perēptory, & offendeth not only against the rule of *Charity*, that bids vs thinke the best of them, whom we knowe not, especially of the *Auntients*; but of *Iustice* also: In that he laieth the fault, of superstitious succeeding ages, vppon the religious and godly Fathers, that were before them. For why might not that be without abuse at the first, which we are certaine, was greatly abused afterwards, as wel as the *sepulchers* of *Martyrs*, & *reliques* of *Saints*, and the *Images* of *Christ*, and his *Apostles*, al which had a good vse at the first, and yet afterwards where occasions of hainous Idolatry and superstition.

P. Martyr in cap. 7. Iudic. Beza de notis Eccles. Cathol.

Yf you meane their religious vse of the signe of the *Crosse* in the Sacrament of Baptism, we vterly disclaime your sentence, and doubt not but that it was free from sinn, and superstition, both in the *Auntients*, and in our *Church*. And to this your rash and inconsiderate condemning of the *Auntient Fathers*, and by them vs, we oppose the more temperate and indifferent opinions, of your owne friends; who by how much they were more learned then your selfe, so much the more modest, and respectiue they were of *Antiquity*, then are you. And because you shal not thinke, that I wil peruert or falsifie their meanings by my interpretation, I will set downe their speeches in their owne words, as I find them in their writings.

M^r *Beza* doth both grant, by way of Cōcession, that there might be a good vse of it in the *Primitiue Church* Beza respons. ad Franc. Baldwin.

Euerit.

Pot. Mar. ep. 4
ad Hopperum.

Aug. cons. Cres-
con. Gramma.
lib. 1. cap. 1.

the Crosse is abused & worshipped by the Papists, what is that to vs? *Indifferentia non possunt illos, qui pura sincerag, agunt mente, & conscientia, contaminare*, why I pray you may not we vse that well, which they vsed ill? As well as an Orthodox writer may vse the same Logick & Rhetoricke, to proue the truth, which Heretickes doe to op-
pugne the truth? Or an honest Souldier vse those weapōs in defence of his couētry, which Rebels and Traytors vse for the destruction and desolation thereof, as was before alleadged out of S^r. *Augustine*. Your proof: holdeth wel for the *materiall signe*, and for the *superstitious* conceipt of the Crosse in Baptisme, but that they adored them as an *Idoll*, remaineth yet to be proved.

Cōcerning the *religious* vse of the signe of the *Crosse* in Baptisme, he saith two things.

First that among the Ancients, it was never free frō sin, and superstition: Secondly if it were, yet being a *humane ordinance*, and abused, & made a most abhominable *Idoll*, no water can clense it &c.

Touching the *first*, which of their religious vses doe you meane? If that which they holde in their actions of common life, we neither commend it, nor condemne it; we condemne it not, because we suppose it may be well vsed, when it is done, only to excite, and put vs in minde of Christ crucified, without any conceite of *vertue* or *meritt*, or *power* therein reposed, as we verily thinke the Ancients vsed it; *Qui mane surgens & vespere cubitum vadens, signat se cruce, in signum Christiane militie, contra Satanam, nō est culpans, modo absit superstitio*. We commend it not, because we knowe how apt the common people are, to be led away with that misconceipt, that so long hath clouen vnto it: And yet we cā no waies
allow

Hem. in cap. 5.
ep. 1. Joan.

allow of yours, nor of your Patriarch T. C. iudgment, See 13. T.C. lib. 1. pag. 170.
 wherwith he censureth it. That the Lord hath left a mark
 of his curse vpon it, whereby it might be perceined to come
 out of the forge of mans braine &c. This censure of his
 is too perēptory, & offendeth not only against the rule
 of Charity, that bids vs thinke the best of them, whom we
 knowe not, especially of the Auntients; but of Iustice
 also: In that he laierh the fault, of superstitious succee-
 ding ages, vppon the religious and godly Fathers, that
 were before them. For why might not that be without
 abuse at the first, which we are certaine, was greatly a-
 bused afterwards, atwel as the sepulchers of Martyrs, &
 reliques of Saints, and the Images of Christ, and his A-
 postles, al which had a good vse at the first, and yet af-
 terwards where occasions of hainous Idolatry and su-
 perstition.

P. Martyr in
 cap. 7. Iudic.
 Beza de notis
 Eccles. Cathol.

Yf you meane their religious vse of the signe of the
 Crosse in the Sacrament of Baptism, we vterly disclaime
 your sentence, and doubt not but that it was free from
 sinn, and superstition, both in the Auntients, and in our
 Church. And to this your rash and inconsiderate con-
 demning of the Auntient Fathers, and by them vs, we
 oppose the more temperate and indifferent opinions, of
 your owne friends; who by how much they were more
 learned then your selfe, so much the more modest, and
 respectiue they were of Antiquity, then are you. And
 because you shal not thinke, that I wil peruert or falsifie
 their meanings by my interpretation, I will set downe
 their speeches in their owne words, as I find them in
 their writings.

M^r Beza doth both grant, by way of Cōcession, that
 there might be a good vse of it in the Primitiue Church

Beza respons^{us} ad
 Franc. Baldwin.

Fuerit

Beza de Eccl.
cuth. nois.

Fuerit sanè tempus, quo fuit aliquis istius signaculi, aduersus Christi crucifixi contemptores vsus: sit etiam diu et libentè a Christianis vsurpatus, pro externa vera religionis professione, & alio in expresse words affirme, Crucis consignationem, cõstat initio fuisse apertam Christianismi professionem.

Heming. in ep.
2. Joann. cap. 5.

Hemings deliuering certaine obseruations & conditions, how the signe of the Crosse may in these daies bewel vled in the Church, concludeth with this testimony of Antiquity. *His rationibus existimo vsos esse signo crucis Augustinum, Epiphanium, Athanasium, qui multũ signaculo crucis tribuerunt, propter significationẽ et admonitionem.*

Bucer in ordin.
Eccles. cap. 12.

Bucers testimony to this purpole is most famous, that it was, *vsus in Ecclesia antiquissimi, admodum simplex, et presentis admonitionis crucis Christi.*

Pexel. in Refus
catech. Iesuis.

Pexelius speaketh more plainly in their commendation, *Antiqui hoc signo profitebantur, quòd Christiani essent, quòd crucis Christi eos non puderet, quòd in Christo spem, et fiduciam omnem collocatam haberent.*

Daneus respon.
ad Bellar. cont.
7. ad cap. 29.

Daneus yet goeth further, and saith *Finis propter quẽ Patres laudes istas signo crucis Christi tribuunt, sanctus et pius est: Patres enim illas laudes scribunt de signo crucis quatenus est, et erat confessionis Christianorum intrepida de Christo testimonium, liberum, apertum, manifestum, licet illis propterea minarentur Ethnici penas grauissimas. Erat igitur huius signi inter Ethnicos vsurpatio, confessio de Christo crucifixo pulcherrima. &c.*

Perkinsus in
Demonst. prob.
cap. de signo
crucis. num. 2.

M^r. Perkins not only exculeth it from superstition in the Ancients, but also declareth, as Daneus did, wherein it was iustly commended by the fathers. His wordes are these. *Crux non fuit à veteribus adorata, multò minus la-*
trid

triâ adorata: veneratio tantum ei tributa fuit, id est v-
sus cum reverentia, eamq; usurparunt in testimonium
fidei sue, simulq; laudant, quatenus fuit signum intrepida
fidei in Christum crucifixum ante ethnicos, etiam dum illi
penas minarentur.

Zanchius speaking of the vse of this signe in *Constan-*
tines time, freeth al the former ages from superstition,
Huc usq; nihil superstitionis habebat signum illud.

*Zanch. de oper.
Redem. l. i. c. 15.*

Lastly Goulartius speaketh more plainly in this point;
then any other, *Quamvis veteres Christiani* (saith he)
externo signo crucis vsi sunt, id tamen fuit sine aliqua su-
perstitione; et doctrina de Christi merito, ab errore, qui
postea irrepfit, pios servavit immunes. And in another
place. *Tertulliani seculo, et aliquot sequentibus, Christi-*
anicum Ethnicis Christum crucifixum deridentibus per-
mixti, ut doctrina salutaris, qua in Christum nos credere
iubet, se minime pudere testarentur, digitis in aere forma-
bant figuram transversam quasi crucis, qua Cerimonia
tunc erat Christianismi, non superstitionis Magica, (ut
postea accidit,) symbolum.

*Goulart. in
Exp. ad Demes.
cap. 19.*

*Idem in Cypri
Ep. 56. ad Thi-
barianos, ca. 7.*

That it might once haue had good vse, and was a pro-
fession of Christianity, as M^r. Beza speaketh, Or that S^t.
Augustine, and other Auntients vsed it with such due
regard, as therto belonged, as Hemingius thinketh, Or
that it was a most auntient vse in the Church, very sim-
ple, and of present admonition of the Crosse of Christ, as
Bucer testifieth: to my vnderstanding doth plainly de-
scribe, a most Christian and religious vse of it, among the
Auntients, and vtterly discover your slaunderous ac-
culation.

But those other that tel you particularly, wherein it was
wel vsed, as Pezel. M. Perk. & by a proposition most ma-

manifestly contradictory vnto yours, say, it had a most *holy* and *godly end*, as *Daneus*, and that it was 'without any *superstition* in the *Auntients*, as *Goulartius*, & *Lanchius* doe, They I say plainly free it from *sin* and *superstition*, and with a contrary testimony in flat termes, conuince the *infolency*, and *audacioufnes* of your *false asseueration*.

Touching the second, *if it were yet being an humane ordinance &c.* your two reasons, *because it is an humane ordinance abused*, and *because it is now also become an Idoll*, are answered before. And it hath oftentimes bin said, that those pollutions how *abominable* soeuer, doe extend them selues no farther, then to the *Persons* that are polluted with them: *Indifferent things* cannot defile them, that vse them with a *sincere minde*, and *pure conscience*, how soeuer they be abused by others:

And therefore you might wel haue spared your huge words, *Execrable, abominable Idoll, filth, no water can cleanse it, nor any pretext purifie it, &c.* except you had brought other arguments then these, the weaknes wherof doth most manifestly appeare. Al the bigg words, that you can bring, wil not make the *uncleannes*, you speake of, defile the *Innocent*, nor the pollution, and abomination of *Popish Idolatry*, cleaue vnto the true *Protestant*, that with a good conscience, vseth the Ceremony, and with hart and soule, abhorreth the superstition. And thus much to the second part of your answer. Your third followeth now to be considered.

Treatise. 10. Sect.

But in very deed to speake as the truth is, the Crosse is retained among vs, with opinion very superstitious. & erroneous. For in the late Canons it is saide, that the Childe is there-

thereby dedicated unto the service of him that died on the Crosse: what is this but to equal mans ordinance with Gods? And to ascribe that unto the Crosse, which is due unto Baptisme? A conceipt fitter for ignorant Papists, then learned Christians to assent unto. Neither do we use it as the Ancients did, for Cyprian, Augustine, Chrysostome and others, as is apparant at those times did consecrate the elements therewith, and did not crosse the childes forehead at all, but referred that unto the Bishops confirmation; So that our crossing the Infants forehead, & not the element of Baptisme, is a meere novelty, without any warrant of that antiquitie. Neither will that place of Tertullian de resurrectione carnis proue the contrary. The flesh is washed, that the soule may bee purged, the flesh is annointed, that the soule may be consecrated, the flesh is signed that the soule may be garded, the flesh is shaddowed by the imposition of hands, that the soule may be by the spirit enlightened, the flesh doth feede on the body & bloud of Christ, that the soule may be filled and fatted of God. In which words, he joining together divers Ceremonies of the Christians, doth indeed mention the signing of the faithfull, but it may as well be referred to confirmatio, expressed by imposition of hands, as to Baptisme, understood by the washing of the body; & that on better reason, for it is more then probable, that the signe of the Crosse was not yet used in Baptisme, seeing, Just. Martyr in defens. ad Antoninum & Tertull. de Baptismo, & de corona militis, doe describe the forme of Baptisme, used in those times, and yet make no mention of the Crosse therein: which in all likelihood they would not have omitted, if it had bin used therein; Especially Tertullian, who in that very place speaketh of the Crosse, as used out of Baptisme in the ordinary blessing of themselves.

An answer to a Treatise

*Replie to the third part of the Treatise
answere to the first obiection.*

This tenth Section containeth two grievous accusations, wherewith the Treatise doth charge our Church, and the governors thereof.

The first, *That the signe of the Crosse is retained among us, with opinion very superstitious and erroneous.*

The second, *That we doe not use it as the Ancients did:* Grievous crimes no doubt, if they be iustly laid vpon vs; But if vniustly, then meere reproaches, and slanders of the Treatise.

Touching the first. S. Hierome saith, *In causa hereseos, neminem decet esse patientem.* It becommeth no man to hold patience, when he is accused of heresie. The Treatise belike, meant to trie our patience, when he burdened vs with opinion of the Crosse both erroneous and superstitious. If he had accused vs of error only, the matter had not bin so very great. For, *homines sumus, errare possumus;* we are men and therefore subiect vnto error. And yet here also he might haue remembred, that the companie of those learned men that made the Canon, was as vni-likely to erre, as either the Treatise or his adherents. But when vnto his accusation of error, he addeth the most heinous crime of *superstition*, this is such an imputation, as whereof by all good meanes we are bound to cleare our selves.

But he proveth it: for in the late Canons, it is said, *that the child is thereby dedicated vnto the service of him, that died on the Crosse, what is this but to equall mans ordinance with Gods? And to ascribe that vnto the Crosse, which is due vnto Baptisme? A conceipt fitter for ignorant Papists then learned Christians to assent vnto.* If wee assented ei-ther

ther to the one or to the other, it were indeede not onlie a conceipt fitter for ignorant Papists, than learned Christians, but also an opinion erroneus and superstitious, and which is more, proud, insolent, and presumptuous too.

But how doth the word *dedicated*, inforce thus much: namely, because the Sacrament, which is Gods ordinance, can doe no more but Dedicate the Infant, to the service of him that died on the Crosse. And therefore when wee saie, the signe of the Crosse, which is but mans invention, doeth Dedicate, doe we not equall mans ordinance with Gods? & ascribe that vnto the Crosse which is due vnto the Sacrament? I answer, no: For first the Sacrament doth more then dedicate only, for it really giueth that which it promiseth, & is to the child that, which it doth signifie. Contrariwise, the Crosse, neither giueth any thing to the child, nor promiseth, nor is any other thing, then an outward Ceremony only, signifying that the child hereafter should not be ashamed to confesse the faith of Christ crucified, &c.

Secondly, the word *Dedicate* doth not alwaies signifie, to sanctifie or to Consecrate, but sometimes to appropriate, to appoint to some speciall vse, to declare and testifie, that the thing is assigned, addicted, and culled out to such, for such a seuerall purpose, office person, or service. And this is most manifest, by that vse of this word, which is most ordinarie and common in our speech: As namel, to dedicate a book to a great personage, is not in our language to consecrate, & sanctifie it vnto him, but by that word of *Dedication*, we testifie and declare our loue, duty, & affection towards him, & appoint the book so dedicated, to be a manifest signe, token, prooffe, argument, and declaration of our loue. The word *Dedicated* therefore being Ecclesiasticall, and very frequent in

this signification, it was thought fitt to be retained in this matter, rather then to take in a word more strang & nothing so significant: Especially considering, that there are many words, and sentences in that Canon, both affirmatiue and negatiue, very sufficient to declare, and make manifest vnto al reasonable men, that the Church of England doeth not attribute any sanctifying, or consecrating of the child to the seruice of Christ, vnto any *vertue, grace, or power*, of, or in the signe of the Crosse.

Thirdly though both the *Sacrament*, and the *signe* of the Crosse may be said to *dedicate*, yet they doe not both dedicate *after the same sort*; for the *Sacrament* doth dedicate *as a signe*, and *as a Sacrament too*, the Crosse as a *signe or ceremony only*, the *Sacrament* doth dedicate as a *cause efficient instrumentall, working inwardly*, by the operation of Gods spirite, the Crosse doth dedicate as a *cause declaratory, testimonial, witnessing outwardly* to the Church, and to the partie that is baptized. And so much the very wordes of the Canon would haue taught you, but that you would not learne, when it saith, *Accounting it a lawfull outward Ceremony, and honorable badge, whereby the Infant is dedicated, &c.*

The wearing of a badge, or cognizance of some noble man, or the colours of some Captaine, doth not, I hope, in your apprehension, make the seruant or souldior that weareth it, to be of such a noble mans retinew, or such a captaines regiment. But because he is of that retinewe, he weareth that badge or cognizance, and because hee is of that regimēt, he weareth those colours. And yet both the one and the other, doth make other men to know, & withall doth put himselfe in remembrance, that such a noble mans man, or such a captaines souldior hee is, and
such

such he ought to shew himselfe to be. Even so it is in the matter of the Crosse. The signe of the Crosse maketh not the childe to be the servant, or souldior of Christ, but because by Baptisme he is so made, therefore he is signed with that honorable badge, that thereby, both other me may know that he is the servant, and souldiour of Christ, and himselfe may be remembred, and admonished, that he is in al his life to shew himselfe as the faithfull servant of such a master, and the couragious souldiour of such a captaine: Which our Communion book most wisely, & beyond all exception of malice, setteth downe in these religious tearmes. *In token, that he shall not be ashamed to confesse the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight vnder his banner, against sin, the world, and the Diuel, and to continue his faithfull souldiour and servant vnto his liues end.*

*Declaratorie
quoad alios,
memoratiue, et
monitorie quo-
ad seipsum.*

Lastly, if the Canon should haue said, *sanctified*, or *co-secrated*, I perceiue, we should haue had much a do with the Treatiser: And yet al Antiquity, as afterwards I shal haue better occasion to declare, and specially S^r. *Augustine* teacheth vs so to say. *Catechumenos*, saith he, *secundum quendam modum suum per signum Christi, & orationem manus impositionis, puto sanctificari.* I thinke the Catechumeni are sanctified, after a certaine manner of theirs, by the signe of Christ, and praier of laying on of handes. But what neede I all edge S^r. *Augustine*, our owne men vse the word *consecrare* to signifie, to allot, or appoint for some vse, as I told you before the word *dedicare* did signifie: As may appeare at large by the testimony of *Gou-lartius*, *Consecrare panem & vinum, est ea diuinis ac sacris vsibus destinare, &c.* But our Canon of purpose declined those words, which might any waies breed offe-
vnro.

*Aug. de peccatis
meritis & re-
missione, lib. 2.
cap. 26.*

*Gou-lart. Cyp.
ep. 63. num. 39.*

vnto the weake brethren, and made choice of this harm-
lesse and innocent word, *Dedicated*, which favorably vn-
derstood, giueth no offence, and is farr from al such dan-
ger of *error & superstition*, as the Treatiser would make
the ignorant reader to belecue.

Your second accusation laieth two greiuous Corrup-
tions to our charge, as namely.

1 *That in the sign of the Crosse we doe not that which the
Auntients did.* For Cyprian Augustine, Chrysostome, and
others, as is apparant, at those times did consecrate the e-
lements therewith, which wee doe not.

2 *That we doe that which the Auntients did not:* For
they did not crosse the childs forehead at all, but referred
that vnto the Bishoppes confirmation: So that our crossing
the Infants forehead, & not the element of Baptisme, is a
mere nouelty, (of some 600. yeares standing as you say in
the *Margent*) without any warrant of that antiquity.

For answer to the first. *That we doe not al that the An-
tients did*, that is, not vse the signe of the Crosse to so
many purposes, as they did, we do easily acknowledge:
But this is nothing to the point in question. For what if
this particular you alleadge, of *consecrating the Element
with the sign of the Crosse*, were one of those *Nauis* of the
Ancients? What if they, haply, did amisse in so doing,
as you say afterwards they did? Or what if they did well
in so doing, & the superstition was brought in afterwards?
Will you haue vs to imbrace their vices as well as their
vertues? Or wil you take away the liberty of our Church
in making choice of her Ceremonies? Or will you hence
conclude, that we may not retaine their good things, for
the which they are worthely commended, except we al-
so receiue those defectes and imperfections, which suc-
cee-

ceeding ages brought in afterwarde? But this is no way agreeable to realō: I rather think it better to follow that counsel that S^r. Hierom giueth, of reading *Origens* works, *Hieron. ad Trā. quill. l. 1. ep. 54.* and to apply it to this matter of the Ceremonies of the Auntients, *Vt bona eorum eligamus, vitemusq; cōtraria, iuxta Apostolum dicentem, omnia probate, quod bonum est tenete &c.* That we choole their good things, and avoid the cōtrary, according to the Apostles saying, Try al things, keepe that which is good. For they which are carried away, either with too much loue, or with too much hatred of him, by the distemper of their stomacke, seeme vnto me to be vnder that curse of the Prophet, *woe be vnto them, that call good euill, and euil good, Iai. 5. 20. that make sower sweete, and sweete sower.*

1. Thess. 1. 3.

But *Cyprian, Augustine, Chrysostome, and others* did consecrate the Elements, you say, with the signe of the Crosse, which we doe not. They did indeed, and in those times they did it wel: If we should now doe the like, we could not choose, but doe very ill.

That they did wel in so doing, I am the rather perswaded for my part, (For I am not willing to conceiue any thing amisse of those blessed, and excellent instruments of Gods glory, that by any reasonable construction of their words may be salued) because they did it without offence, in respect of others, and without opinion of vertue ascribed to the signe of the Crosse, if you respect their owne iudgments. without offence to others, for at that time the Institution of that Ceremony, & the reasons of the Institution, were so wel knowne vnto al men, that no man could be ignorant of them, nor take offence at them: without opinion of vertue in the signe, in their owne iudgments, Because that consecration or

Aug. de peccat.
meritis & re-
miss. lib. 2. c. 26.

Cyp. de passion.
dom. cap. 11.
Sec. 12.

sanctification which they attributed to the signe of the Crosse, was rather *in name* so called, then any *hallowing* indeed, and rather an *outward declaration*, that the Elements were consecrated then *any cause* of their consecration. And that this was their conceit of the signe of the Crosse, is most manifestly apparant by those words of S^r. *Augustine*. *Sanctificatio Cathechumeni, si non fuerit baptizatus, non sibi valet ad intrandū regnum cælorū, aut ad remissionē peccatorū*. Againe, they did not ascribe that consecratiō of the elements, how little soever they thought it to be, vnto the sign of the Crosse, which they made vpon it, but alwaies with the signe ioined something els. So the same S^r. *Augustine* in that place where he saith, *Cathechumenos secundum quendam modum suū puto consecrari per signum Christi*, doth not rest there, & say only, *Signū Christi*, but ioineth thereunto, *et orationem manus impositionis*. and so S^r. *Cyprian*, whose testimony you cite afterwards, saith indeed, *Operationis auctoritas in figura crucis, omnibus sacramentis largitur effectum* but withal he addeth, (which you thought widdome to suppress, as not making for your purpose) & *cuncta peragit Nomen, quod omnibus nominibus eminet, a sacramentorum vicarijs invocatum*. But of this we shall say more in the 12. section.

Goulart. in Cy-
prian Epist. 56. titus.
ad Thibarian.

That we should doe very ill, if we should vse this Ceremony now, these reasons induce me to cōceiue. *First*, The people are now more prone to error, and misconceit, then they were in those times. *Secōdly*, some things, and among others this, were more fit for those times, then for these. *Distinguenda sunt tempora*, saith *Goulart*. *prian* Epist. 56. *titus*. and before him S^r. *Augustine*, and then it will easily appear, that that may be done wel at one time, which can-

cannot be done wel at another. *Mutat à quippe temporis causa, quod rectè ante factum fuerit, ita mutari vera ratio plerumq; flagitat, ut cum aliqui dicant, non rectè fieri, si mutetur, contra veritas clamet, rectè non fieri nisi mutetur: quia utrumq; tum erit rectum, si erit pro temporū varietate diuersum.* As in a child many things are permitted by the Parents, which wil not be, when he is come to riper yeares: So in that *infancy* and *innocency* of the Church, many things might wel be done, by the Aun-
tients, which cannot be wel done by vs, now in the mā-
hood, or rather *old age* of the Church: And lawful it was for them, while Christianity was yet but *greene*, to be led and brought on by those outward rudiments, which we haue no neede of now.

If you aske, why these reasons, should not aswel make against the signing of the Childe in the forehead, as against the signing of the Elements, The answer is easie: *first*, the danger is not so great, nor so remediable in the one; as in the other, *Secondly*, the ends are different: The signing of the Childs forehead was then, and is now, for *admonition*; The signing of the Elements, was the dangerous, and would now be desperat for *consecration*, if we should imbrace it: And therefore me thinks, you should rather commend the wisdom of our Church, which out of the nūber of those Ceremonies, which were troublesome to good consciences, and burdensome to the Church, as that learned Bishop speaketh, hath culled those which were *harmefulle*, then any way dislike vs, for not retaining all those ceremonies of this signe, which though vsed by the Ancients, might proue scandalous to the weaker sort.

Inell. in Apolog.

For answer to the *Second*, That we doe that which the

An answer to a Treatise

Ancients did not, for they did not crosse the childes forehead at all, but referred that vnto the Bishops confirmation. I make no doubt, but the Treatiser by the Ancients, that he speaketh of, entredeth those especially, that were nearest vnto the Apostles times, & that flourished within the compasse of the first three hundred yeares: vvhich by al men is reputed the purest age, & as it were, the maidenhead, and virginity of the Church. For he cannot be ignorant, that in the ages that succeeded after them, this custome was most ordinary & frequent in all Churches. This supposed I answered:

First, That either the Treatiser is deceived, or the whole Christiā world for so many ages together, hath bin very greatly overleene, that, ever since the first times, even from such as lived with the Apostles theselues, haue receaved this consignatiō of the childes forehead in Baptisme, as one of the most ancient Ceremonies of christi-anity. This is acknowledged, not only by our best late writers, whole speeches to that purpose I haue reported before, in the 88. and 89. pages, but also by the Ancients, out of whō they learned it, whole authorities come now to be considered. So that if the Treatiser can reforme this common errour, of so many learned men, and of so long continuance; he shal do (no doubt,) a good work, & a great service to the Church of Christ; This hee cannot bring about, except hee either deny the authorities of the Ancients, or giue their words some other interpretation, then they doe apparantly signifie, & al men hitherto haue made of them.

*Dionysius lib.
Eccles. Hierar.
cap. 4. & 5.*

Dionysius commonly called Areopagita (whether truly or falsly I wil not discusse, but certainly a very ancient writer,) maketh often mention, of signing the party that
is

is baptised, with the sign of the Crosse, And to expresse that he meaneth the Crosse in Baptisme, he calleth the Sacrament of Baptisme *αὐγοὺς καὶ σταυρίδα*, the Sacramēt or scale having the forme of a Crosse; And describing the māner how it was done, he saith, *Imponit (minister) eius capiti manum, cōsignansq; illum, sacerdotibus mādat, virum susceptoremq; describant.* This authority must needs be vnderstood of Baptisme, which he there describeth, calling it *Sacramentum illuminationis*, and can by no interpretation be referred either to the Element, as is manifest by the words, *Imponit eius capiti manum, cōsignansq; illum*, nor to the Bishoppes confirmation.

The like is to be thought of that place of *Iustin Martyr*, who florished about the yeare of Christ 140. *Dextrā manu in nomine Christi consignamus eos, qui hoc signo egent*: where, *first* al men vnderstand him, to meane the consignation of the Crosse. *Secondly*, that he cannot meane it of confirmation, it is more then probable, because hee mentioneth only *dexteram manum*, whereas confirmation requireth imposition of both; *ut adumbratio septiformis gratiae melius significaretur*, that the adumbration of the seauen-fold grace, might thereby be the better signified. *Thirdly*, it cannot be vnderstoode of the Element of Baptisme, for his wordes are *consignamus*; &c. *qui hoc signo egent*. importing the persons, and not the Element. Neither *lastly* can it be referred to that use of the Crosse, which they obserue in actions of common life, because in that, euery man did signe him selfe, but in this he speaketh of such as were signed by other men.

Iust. Mart. ref. ad corib. q. 118.

The next that I will remember after him, is *Origen* (for *Tertullians* testimony, 'because the Treatiser alleadgeth it against vs, shalbe cōsidered afterwards) who

Origen. Homil.
2. in Psal. 38.
Tom. I.

lived in the same age with *Tertullian*, though somewhat after him, about the yeare of our Lord 220. his words are these. *Vt non exprobremur ab insipiente, cōvertamus nos ab omnibus iniquitatibus nostris, ne deprehendens in nobis maculas peccatorum, id est, suae voluntatis insignia, exprobet, et dicat, ecce hic Christianus dicebatur, et signo Christi signabatur in fronte, meas autem voluntates, et mea chirographa gerebat in corde. Ecce iste, qui mihi et operibus meis renuntiavit in Baptismo, meus rursū operibus se inseruit meisq; legibus paruit.* This is an evident testimony against the Treatiser, mentioning both *Baptisme*, and the *signe of the Crosse*, and the *forehead* where on it was signed.

Secl. 12.

Cyprian de v.
mis. Eccl. ca. 16.

From *Origen* I come to *S^t. Cyprian*, who was famous in the Church about the yeare 250. whose testimonies against the Treatisers assertion, as I will not take vpon me to repeat the al, (for they are very many,) so it cannot be either disliked or suspected, if I acquaint the reader with some few: especially seeing the Treatiser himselfe doeth acknowledge *Cyprian* to be the first, that maketh mention of the Crosse in Baptism. In his treatise *de unitate Ecclesiae*, he hath these words. *Ozias Rex lepra varietate in fronte maculatus est, ea parte corporis notatus offenso Domino, ubi signantur, qui dominum promerentur.* Again, to *Demetrian* Proconsull of *Africke*, he speaketh thus. *Evadere eos solos posse, qui renati & signo Christi signati fuerint*, and a little after, *Hunc (Christum) si fieri potest, sequamur omnes, huius sacramento & signo consecremur.* In all which places, as also in his fifty sixt Epistle *ad Thibaritanos*, and his third booke *Testimon. ad Quirinum*, not only *Pamelius* who may seeme somewhat partial for the Crosse, but *Goulartius* also, whom the Treatiser cannot

Ad Demet. ca.
19.

Cap. 22.

Cap. 7.

Cap. 22.

sub

suspect, doe acknowledge that he speaketh of the Crosse in Baptisme.

Lactantius that lived after *Cyprian* about some 50. yeares, and flourished in the beginning of the yeare 300 speaketh much to the same purpose. *Extendit Christus in passione manus suas, orbemq; dimensu est ut iam tum ostēderet, ab ortu solis vsq; ad occasum, magnum populum ex omnibus linguis, & tribubus congregatū, sub alas suas esse venturum, signumq; illud maximum atq; sublime, in frontibus suis suscepturum.* *De vera sapientia lib. 4. cap. 26.*

After *Lactantius* lived *S^c. Basil the great* in the Church of *Casarea Cappadocia*, in the yeare 370. or thereabouts, who rehearsing the traditiōs vled in his time, reckoneth this in the first place. *Vi signo crucis eos signemus, qui in Christo spem suam posuerunt.* *Basil de spiritu sancto. cap. 27.*

The last of this age, is *S^c. Augustine*, whose glorious labours lightened the Christian world, about the end of the yeare 300. To rehearse his many testimonies vvere an endlesse worke, and therefore I will content my selfe with two only, the former in his fourth booke *de fide & Symbolo ad Catechumenos*, which he beginneth with these words, *Per sacratissimum crucis signum, vos suscepit in utero, sancta mater Ecclesia:* and the latter in his exposition of the 30. *Psalme. Non sine causa signum suū Christi in fronte nobis figi voluit, tanquam in sede pudoris, ne Christi opprobrio Christianus erubescat.* To the which purpose he speaketh in *Psal. 141. vsq; adeo de cruce non erubesco ut non in occulto loco habeam crucē Christi, sed in fronte portem, &c.* *Aug. de fide & symb. ad Catech. lib. 4. cap. 1.*
In Psal. 30.
In Psal. 141.
To which place I refer the reader as all to his 53. and 118. Treatise, vpon *S^c. Iohn:* & his 181. sermon *de tempore*, and diuers other places. So that these proofs of the *Ancients* duly considered, we may

Demonst. prob.
ea. de signo cru-
cis.
Refut. Cathol.
Jesuitic.

may be bould to pronounce against the Treatiser, that the Auntients did yse to signe the Childs forehead in Baptisme, and to affirme with M^r. Perkins, *Signum crucis per multa secula fuit in sacramenti administratione, simplex ritus*; and with Pezelius. *vetus est hac Ceremonia ab ipsis incunabilis Ecclesie Christianae usurpata.*

The collection therfore of the Treatiser is vaine, whē he concludeth after this sort.

They that in the vse of the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, doe not consecrate the Element, which the Auntients did, & doe crosse the Childs forehead, which the Auntients did not, doe not vse the signe of the Crosse, in Baptisme as the Auntients did.

But the Church of England in the vse of the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, doth not consecrate the Element, which the Auntients did, and doth crosse the Childs forehead which the Auntients did not. Ergo.

The Church of England doth not vse the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme as the Auntients did.

For first, touching the forme, it is a Sophisme compounded of all manner of Fallacies: that which is most apparant is, *Fallacia compositionis*: for *ex propositione vera in sensu composito, infer conclusionem falsam in sensu diuiso*. Touching the matter, it is meerly false. For in the *Maior* it doth assume, that the Auntients did not vse to signe the Childs forehead, which is refuted by their alleadged authorities.

Secondly he doth conclude the abuse of one Ceremony, by the Non vse of another, which hath neither relation vnto it, nor dependency on it, nor both are ordained to the same end: & therfore the one cannot necessarily inferre the negation or affirmation of the other: as if
with

with lesse adoe. and in fewer circumstances, he should haue concluded thus.

They that in the vse of the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, doe not vse consecration of the Element at all: doe not vse the consignation of the forehead well, and as the Auntients did.

But the Church of England in the vse of the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, doth not vse consecratio of the Element at all. Ergo.

The Church of England doth not vse the consignation of the forehead rightly, and as the Auntients did.

The not vsing of consecration at al, is no reason why the consignation of the forehead may not be vsed rightly. For though both agree in this, that they both be consignations, and are both vsed in the Sacrament of Baptisme, yet they differ in this, that they are distinct Ceremonies, differing one from another in nature, for they are meerly distinct, and haue no dependency, the one of the other: & in vse, For they are not *ad Idem*, they haue not both reference to the same end and action. the one presumptuously going before the Sacrament, and arrogating to it selfe some kind of preparing of the Action, the other modestly coming after, and admonishing vs only, what we promised in the Action.

I might better conclude thus against their nouelties in the Lords supper.

They which doe not receiue the Communion kneeling, which the Auntients did, and doe receiue it standing or sitting, which the Auntients did not, doe not receiue the communion as the Auntients did.

But the Treatiser and his adherents doe not receiue the communion kneeling, which the Auntients did, and doe

*Genicularis
specie habet pia
& Christiane
venerationis, ac
proinde potius
olim cum fructu
vsiuari. Ber.
Epist. 12.*

receiue it standing or sitting, which the *Auntients* did not,
Ergo:

The *Treatiser* and his adherents doe not receiue the
communion as the *Auntients* did.

For here, though the Ceremonies of kneeling which
the *Auntients* vſed, and of sitting or standing, which the
Treatisers trends vſe, be different, the one frō the other:
yet both the affirmatiō of the one, doth necessarily inter
the negation of the other, and also both of them are or-
dained to the ſame end and Actiō, namely the recei-
ving of the communion.

Thirdly the *Treatiser* aſſuming it, as a thing granted,
that the Ceremony of *conſecrating* the Element, is aun-
tienter then the Ceremony of *ſigning the forehead*, doth
thervpon conclude, that the moſt aun-ient of the Fa-
thers vſed the *conſecration* of the Element, long before
the *conſignatiō* of the forehead was heard of. Wherin he
is exceedingly deceived: For though the Ceremony of
conſecration be of great antiquity, yet he may learne of
M^r. Perkins, that it is not to compare with *conſignation*.
For he ſaith, *Annu a Chriſto 300 crux tranſiens*, (which
is the *conſignation* of the Croſſe) *fuit ſignum externa*
profeſſionis fidei: not only *adhibitum in vitā communi*, as
he ſaith, but in *Baptiſme* alſo, as before is proued out of
the *Auntients*: But M^r. Perkins ſtaieth not there, he ſaith
further: *vix vnquam adhibita fuit ad ſignandum ſacra-*
mēta, niſi circa annum 400. Neither then was it ſtraight-
way vſed in cōſecrating of the Elemēts, but by degrees:
primò ut ſignaret nobis Chriſti bona, Aug: tract: 118. in
Ioannem: *tum poſtea vt per eam benedictio ſacramenti*
& conſecratio fieret.

Why the *Treatiser* ſhould deliuer vs this ſtrange doc-
trine,

Perkins demon-
ſtrati cap. de ſig-
no crucis.

trine, That the *Auntients* did not use to signe the Childs forehead at all in Baptisme, I cannot conceiue: only I suppose his error might come thus: The *Auntients* speaking of two uses of the cōsignatiō, the one in commō life, the other in the Sacrament, as is said before, doe make farre more often mention of the vse in common life, then of the other, and somtimes ioine them both together in one periode: So that except the iudgment, of the reader, can direct him to descerne, which clause belongeth to the one vse, & which to the other, the error in this point is very easy: And so it seemeth the Treatiser was deceiued, applying al their speeches wherfoeuer, to the vse in common actions, and referring none to that in the Sacrament of Baptisme. But now let vs see how he pro- ueth his assertion.

First the *Auntients* referred that, (saith he,) to the Bishoppes confirmation, so that our crossing the infants forehead, & not the Element of Baptisme, is a meere noueltie &c: True it is, that in confirmation, the Childs forehead was signed by the Bishopp, but how doth this cō- uince, that in Baptisme it was not signed by the Minis- ter? That in confirmation, the Childs forehead was signed, we easily belecue, for so *Tertullian* telleth vs in many p^laces, and *Cyprian* in his Epistle ad Iubaianum, *Nunc quoq; apud nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesia baptizantur, prae- positae Ecclesiae offerantur, per nostram orationem, ac ma- nus impositionem spiritum sanctum consequantur, et signa- culo Domini consumantur.* But the affirmation of this doth not inferre a negation of the other. Yes, say you, they referred that vnto the Bishoppes confirmatiō: They referred indeed confirmation, and al the rites, and Cere- monies therof, vnto the Bishopp, as was meete: But did

Tertull. de Bap^t cap. 8.

Cyp. ep. 73. de Heret. baptiz. Cap. 8.

not they, thinke you, performe al, the rites of Baptisme themselves? your speech doth import as if you fauored confirmation, and allowed of the consignation there. If you sauer it *truly*, I am glad: for the Ceremony of confirmation is auntient, and hath a good vse (& yet I know not that our Bishoppes vse the consignation of the Crosse in that action) If you mention it only for your purpose, without any allowance of the confirmation, it seemeth you care not what you say, so you may giue the least blowe to our settled orders of the Church. It seemeth likewise, that you ascribe greater antiquity to the signing in confirmatiō, then to that in Baptisme: For you inferre immediatly here vpon, that our crossing the Infants forehead is a meere nouelty. I cannot yeeld, that the signing in confirmation should be auntienter then the signing in Baptisme, no more then I can yeeld, that confirmation is auntienter then Baptisme: And yet for al that, I acknowledge the signing in confirmation to be very auntient, & am glad to heare you argue for the antiquity of that, which your admonitiō to the Parliament so much extenuateth, calling it *superstitious, not agreeing to the word of God, Popish, and peenish, full of toies, & degenerating frō the first institution*: (I am glad I say, to hear you plead the antiquity of that Ceremony, though it be with opposition to an auntienter) but yet I nether acknowledge confirmation so auntient as Baptisme: Nor the signing of confirmation, so auntient, as the signing of Baptisme.

Because you thought, wee woulde not beleeeue this strange speech of yours vpon your bare word, without prooffe, you note vnto vs in your margent: *Tertull. de Baptismo cap. 7. et 8. Euseb. l. 6. c. 42. Innocent. l. ep. ad Decentium*

tiū num. 3. Rabanus Maurus de institutione Clericorū,
ca. 30. Durand. Rational divin. li. 1. cap. de consecrat. You
 might haue done wel to haue reported their words too,
 and no doubt, you would haue done it, had they been so
 pregnant for your purpose, as you make shew. *Tertullian* Tertull. de bap-
tis. cap. 9.
 in that place confesseth indeede, that the signe was vsed
 in confirmatiō, but neither there, nor in any other place
 doth he deny it of Baptism. Your second authority shew-
 eth that *Novatus* the Hereticke after his Baptisme, *reli-* Ensb li. 6. c. 43
qua consecutus non est post morbum, quā iuxta Ecclesia ca-
nonem consequi debebat, ob signationem uidelicet ab Epif-
sopo. But how doth this proue that the sign was not vsed
 in his Baptisme? The like may be said to your testimony
 out of *Innocentius*, his words indeede are. *De consignan-* Innocent. ad De
cens ep. 1. 10m. 1
coacil.
diū Infantibus manifestū est, nō ab alio quā Episcopo fieri
licere. But he speaketh this of confirmatiō, only which he
 there proveth must be ministred by the Bishop alone, he
 maketh no mention of Baptisme at al. Your other two au-
 thorities out of *Rabanus* and *Durandus* speake somewhat
 more plainly & directly to your purpose: for the first saith
signatur baptizatus cum Chrismate per Sacerdotem in ca- Raban. Maurus
de Instit. cle-
rico. lib. 1. c. 30.
pitis summitate, per pontificem vero in fronte, &c. The se- Durand. ration.
divin. lib. 1. cap
de consecrat. lib
6. cap. 83.
 cond saith: *Christiani bis ante Baptismū inunguntur oleo*
benedicto. primò in pectore. deinde inter scapulas, & bis
post Baptismum, primò in vertice, deinde per Episcopum
in fronte, making a distinction of the places: To these I
 answer.

First, That they make a distinction of the place where
 this signe was made: in Baptisme on the crowne, in cōfir-
 mation on the forehead: But they make no distinction of
 the signe, for they say, that the childe in both was signed,
 whereas your prooffe should be, that the childe was not

signed in Baptisme.

Durand. lib. 6.
ration. cap. 83.

Ibid. cap. 84.

Secondly, I say that this difference, of the vpper parte of the head, and the forehead, is a nice difference, and might well haue bin the deuile of latter times: Especiallie seeing *Durandus* saith: *Præter tres vñctiões introductæ sunt potius vsu, quam per aliquā scripturā.* Thirdly, I answer that in *Durandus* time, the childe in Baptism was not signed in the crown only, but in the forehead too: For so saith *Durandus* your owne author: *Sextum donum Baptismi est in vertice, id est in summitate capitis, super cerebrū cū chrismate facta per vñctiō: septimū est in fronte chris-matio:* and that you may be sure, that this, *in fronte chris-matio*, was with the signe of the Crosse, he tels you, that *omnia chris-mata cum crucis figurā perficiuntur.* Lastly, I oppole to those late writers, the authorities of the Ancients before rehearsed, and withall the iudgement and liberty of our Church, which rather chose to follow the vniforme simplicity of the Ancients, then the diuers multiplicitie of these latter writers, whom I suppose you doe not quote, (especiallie *Durandus*) for any liking you haue of them, or credit you yeeld to their authorities.

But our crossing of the Infants forehead, and not the Element of Baptisme, is a meere novelty of some 600. yeares standing, &c.

Our crossing of the Infants forehead, & not the Element is no noveltie, as hath bin already shewed. Your speech doth sound as if, if we did crosse both the forehead, & the element: then it were no novelty. And this is true too: For crossing of the element also is ancient, though not so ancient as the crossing of the forehead alone. As for your marginal note, of some 600. yeares standing, it is so manifest an vnt ruth, as I marvaile, you could be per
lwa.

swaded to set it downe.

Secondly, your second prooffe is out of *Tertullian*. Neither wil that place of *Tertullian*, de resurrectione carnis, prove the contrary: *Caro abluitur, ut & anima emaculetur, caro ungitur ut anima consecratur, caro signatur, ut & anima muniatur, caro manus impositione adumbratur, ut & anima spiritu illuminetur, caro corpore & sanguine Christi vescitur, ut & anima de Deo saginetur*. Hēce you gather that though indeed he mention the signing of the faithfull, yet it may bee as well referred to confirmation as to Baptisme: True; And yet more properly to Baptism, thē to confirmatiō. For in these words, alluding as you say, to diverse Ceremonies of the Christians, it is far more likely (as any man that is acquainted with his articulate manner of writing wil thinke) that he endeavoured rather, equally to fit each severall clause to his severall Ceremonie, then to apply any one to two: which must needs follow vpon your interpretation.

Thirdly, your third prooffe is a probability. it is more then probable, say you, that the signe of the Crosse was not yet used &c. The probability you speake of, is none at al. Concerning *Iustine Martyr* in his second Apologie to *Antoninus*, it was not necessary that he should there mention any thing more, then those things, which did belong to the substance of Baptisme: For his purpose was to be breife, and not to propose every Ceremony of Christianity, but to mention only their prayers, and the things essentiall in the Sacrament. And therefore no marvaile, if he did omit this Ceremony here, especially seeing he doth remember it else where, as hath bin shewed, & euen in this Apologie he saith before, that nothing was done, without this figure of the Crosse. Concerning *Tertullian*

tullian, not remembering it in the places, you cite, who, you say, would not have omitted it, if it had bin then vsed: especially in that very place, where he speaketh of the Crosse, as vsed out of Baptisme: I answer that euen that might be sufficient reason, why he omitted it, when he spake of Baptisme: Because he that saith, *omnem progressum, omnem promotum, and quacumq; nos conversatio exercet &c.* doth except none, and therefore not Baptisme. Again he that saith it was vsed, in *Actions of civil conuersation*, doth leaue no place of doubt, but that it was much rather vsed in their *holy actions of Religion*. Lastly there are some learned mē, that vnderstand those words in the seuenth chapter: *Exinde egressi de lauacro perungimur benedicta unctione*, of the sign of the Crosse, which was vsed in all annoyntings, as you heard before out of Durandus.

Treatise. II. Sect.

2. Obiection.

But the signe of the Crosse is not vsed in Baptisme, but when Baptisme is ended.

Treatisers answer to our 2. Obiection.

If you take Baptisme, only for that dipping and sprinkling of the party, it is true, and so none of the Popish additions, vvhetherby they defile the holy Sacrament, are in Baptisme, for those, which apud Bellar. Baptism. comitantur are not impious: But if you take Baptisme, as indeede we doe, for the administration of that Sacrament, then both the praiers before, and the praiers after the Actions, after the dipping, doe all indifferently belong to one and the selfe same thing: yet it is all, vna & continua actio administrationis sacramenti: Sure it is, that it must be said to be, either in Baptismo, extra Baptismum, aut nullibi, if it bee
out

out of Baptisme, how is it by common consent of all said to be, *signum crucis in Baptismo*.

Replie to the Treatisers answere

to our second obiection.

This whole answere to our second obiection is nothing else but a meere cauil of the Treatisers: For though the whole action, being *una et continua actio administrationis sacramenti*, as you name it, be called Baptisme: Yet it is so called, *a digniori parte*, and therefore we may very wel, & ought alwaies to distinguish, between those things, which are *essentiall* in this action, and those things, which are *accidentall*, betwene those things which are the *substance* of Baptisme, and those things which are for *decency*, & *ornament*. For *ne ij quidem, qui ista excogitarunt, vel ab alijs introducta defenderunt, alind esse censuerunt, quam Baptismi ornamenta*.

No, say you, you must not so distinguish, but you must take Baptisme as we doe: for otherwise *None of the Popish additions, whereby they defile that holy Sacrament, are in Baptisme, for those which apud Bellarminum Baptismum comitantur, are not impious*: Al this notwithstanding, you must giue vs leaue to distinguish those thing, which in their owne nature are distinct: True it is that none of those *quae apud Bellarminum Baptismum comitantur*, are of their owne *nature impious*, neither are they of the essence of Baptisme: and therefore wee hold, that they which are Baptized, in the Church of Rome, are rightly Baptized. But if those *apud Bellarminum* are not *impious*, as you say, why call you them *Antichristian*? and if they be *Antichristian*, how are they not *impious*? we see your kind affectiō towards our Church: Our signing with the Crosse in Baptisme is *Antichristian*, as you call

call it in the 14. Section, and yet these Popish additions, that defile the Sacrament are not impious.

Your argutation, that it must be either, *in Baptismo, extra Baptismum, aut nullibi*, is answered in a word. It is *in Baptismo*, that is, *in administratione Baptismi*, & not *in essentia Baptismi*. It is in Baptisme as an outward decent Ceremony, and ornament of the action, not as an inward part or substance of the Sacrament.

Treatise. Section. 12.

2. Objection.

The signe of the Crosse is very auntient.

Treatisers answer to our 3. obiectiō.

So are many popish traditions, and if on that ground, we are to retaine it, why doe we not giue the Baptized, *lactis et mellis concordia*? why doe we not bring offerings for the dead? for Tertullian the first of the Fathers that euer mentioned the Crosse, doth establish these, & the signe of the Crosse, by one, and the selfe same warranty. Besides if upon the Fathers tradition wee use the Crosse, then must we receiue, and use it, as they haue deliuered it vnto vs, that is, with opinion of vertue, & efficacy, not only in the Act of blessing our selues, and in the expelling of Diuells, but euen in the consecration of the blessed Sacra-

ments: For the first Tertullian is wittnes. *Ad omnē progressum, ad omnem promotum, ad omnem aditum, atq; exitum, ad vestitum et calceatum, frontem crucis signaculo terimus*: For chasing of Diuells, Hierome counsellerh Demet. vir. *to use the Crosse*: *et crebo inquit signaculo crucis munias frontem tuam, ne exterminator Aegypti in te locum reperiat*: Lactantius de hoc signo scribens, ait Christi sectatores, inquinatos spiritus signo passionis excludere: Chrysostom: in Psalm: 109. *Crux inquit m-*

nit

De coron. milis.

*Lib. 2. 20. epist.
ad Demetr.*

Lib. 4. cap. 17.

nit mentem, ea dæmones vlc. scitur, ea tollit morbos animæ. But these superstitions are small in regard of that efficacy, which in the Sacraments, antiquity ascribed vnto Cyprian. de the Crosse: For Cyprian (being the auncientest, that maketh mention of the Crosse in Baptisme) speaketh of it. cuius virtus omnia peragit Sacramenta, sine quo signo nihil est sanctum, neq; aliqua consecratio meretur effectū; And againe: Quicumq; sunt Sacramentorum ministri, qualescunq; sunt manus quæ vel mergunt accedentes ad Baptismum, vel vngunt, qualescunq; pectus, de quo sacra exeunt verba, operationis autoritas in figura crucis omnibus Sacramentis largitur effectum: August. in Joh. tract. 118. Quod signum inquit nisi adhibeatur siue frōtibis credentium, siue ipsi aquæ, qua regenerantur, siue oleo quo Chrismate inunguntur, siue sacrificio quo aluntur, nihil eorum rite perficitur: It were superfluous to rehearse the rest.

Replie to the Treatisers answer to our third Obiection.

I looked in this place, that you would rather haue proved, the *noveltie* of this Ceremony, and that it is no ancienter then of some 600. yeares standing (as you please to iest before) then so easily yeeld, that it is *very ancient*, as here you doe: For you doe not deny the *antiquitie*, that which was obiected, but imply, That *antiquity* is no cause *sufficient* why wee should vse it, because, say you, to are many other *Popish traditions*.

Your answer containeth these two branches.

1 If *antiquitie* be a cause, why we should retaine it, why should we not retaine other Ceremonies also, as *ancient* as this?

2 If vpon the *Fathers tradition* wee vse the Crosse,

why then doe we not vse it with opinion of *vertue & efficacy*, as they haue delivered it?

Vnto this your answer you add by way of Corollary that though it be *ancient*, yet *antiquity* could never free it from *sin, & superstition*: wherupō you make two observations.

1 How *dangerous* a thing it is to bring in any *humane invention* into the service of God.

2 How it may iustly be reputed *Popish & Antichristian*, though it were before those times wherein *Poperie and Antichrist* were hatched.

First: we doe not thinke, that *Antiquity alone* without *reason and truth*, is cause *sufficient*, why wee shoulde retain a Ceremony: Yet it may giue vs good cause, to examine the reasons, that moved the fathers to vse it, and not without iust cause rashly to abrogate and disanull it. Now because our Church by examining those reasons, that caused the Fathers to institute, & vse this Ceremony of the Crosse in Baptisme, hath founde, that as it vvas then, so it may be stil a Ceremony of *decencie, and profitable admonition* in the Church: shee hath therefore according to that *liberty*, which in matter of *Ceremonie*, is permitted to every *seuerall Church*, retained this, & abrogated some other, which in her iudgmēt, seemed both more burdensome, & lesse profitable. These *reasons* concurring with *antiquity*, adde the greater weight vnto it, as on the other side, it addeth also vnto them; & *all of the together yeeld cause very sufficient*, why some *ancient Ceremonies* rather be retained, then *other some*. And therefore to your *first question*, why doe we not vse other *ancient Ceremonies* as well as this, I answere, Because our Church thought them not so *necessary, nor convenient*. Shee might, no doubt, haue still retained them, if shee would

would: For I willingly submit my weaker iudgement to that most graue, and learned iudgment of M^r. Bucer: *De* Bucer in 4. eo
ceteris signis, quæ in sacris adhibita sunt à veteribus, vel ad Ephes.
hodie adhibentur à multis, ut sunt ignis ad exorcismos, &
catechismos, & alba vestis Baptizatorum, sacer panis qui
dabatur Catechumenis, & pleraq; alia sic sentio: Si quæ Ec-
clesia essent, quæ puram Christi tenerent doctrinam, et
sinceram seruarent disciplinam, hisq; signis uterentur sim-
pliciter, et pure, absq; omni superstitione, vel leuitate,
præse ad pias admonitiones, easq; probe omnibus intel-
lectas, eas Ecclesias non possum equidem, propter signorum
salem vsum condemnare.

Your two examples of *Lactis et mellis concordia*, and
offerings for the dead, are auncient Ceremonies indeed,
 & in those times, had, no doubt, their very good & pro-
 fitable vse: as of the former *Tertullian* testifieth *lib. de*
coron. mil. cap. 3. and of the latter, both *M^r. Beza*, & Beza de notis
Peter Martyr, as is recorded before. & therefore though Ecclef.
Tertullian doth establish thele, & the signe of the Crosse, P. Martyr in ca.
 with the same warrant of tradition, or Ecclesiasticall
 constitution, yet our Church counteth them not so ne-
 cessary, nor so fitt for these latter times. 7 Iudicium.

The second braunch of your answer is: *If vpon the*
Fathers tradition, we vse the Crosse, then must we receive,
and vse it, as they haue deliuered it vnto vs, that is with
opinion of vertue and efficacy. Supposing that this opini-
 on of vertue & efficacy (wherof we shall say more after-
 wards) was euill in the *Fathers*, yet there is no realō, why
 we hauing free liberty to make our choice, should be
 bound to take their euill things with their good, as hath
 bin shewed before out of *S^r. Hierome*. For he that gaue
 vs the free commission of, *omnia probate, restrained vs* Pag. 97.

only to good things in our choice *quod bonum est tenere.*

But my affection (willing I confesse in nothing rashly to accuse the Auntients) leadeth me rather to thinke, that euē this opiniō of vertue & efficacy that you speake of, was no euill thing in them, For though they vsed the consignation of the Crosse, in those actions, that you mentiō a litle after, yet they yeelded no opiniō of vertue and efficacy, to that signe, but to the *Crosse, & passion of Christ*, wherof that signe was an outward token and resemblance. And this I hope to make apparant to the indifferent reader, in every particular of your accusation.

First therfore you accuse them for ascribing *virtue & efficacy*, to the signe of the Crosse in the *Act of blessing* themselues, in common conversation: & this you proue out of *Tertullians Ad omnem progressum atq; promotum, &c.* But what if they by this act of *signing* theselues with the signe of the Crosse, did not intend *blessing* of themselues, as you tearme it, but *remembrance* of Christes benefits performed for them on the Crosse? For so S. Cyrill answereth *Julian the Apostata*, when hee had called the Christians, *miseros quibus curae esset semper, & domos & frontes, signo pretiosi crucis signare. Haec omnia* (saith hee) meaning the benefits of Christs passiō which he had recited before) *recordari nos facit salutare lignum, & suadet ut cogitemus, quod, sicut dixit diuinus Paulus, unus pro omnibus mortuus est ut uiuentes non ultra sibi ipsis uiuāt sed ei qui pro ipsis mortuus est & resurrexit.* And a litle after, *pretiosi ligni cruorem facimus in memoriā omnis boni & omnis virtutis.* What if they ascribed not this vvhich you call *blessing*, to the signe of the Crosse, but to *Christs passion*, represented and remembered vnto them by this signe? for so M. Perkins teacheth you to thinke of them:

Cyrrill. Alexand.
contr. Iulianum
lib 6. om 3.

2. Cor. 5. 15.

Crux (apud veteres) non significat ipsum signū crucis, sed per Metonymiam passionem crucifixi. To which purpose he expouideth Constantines in tēto rixā, id est, Deo, non signo: and citeth an authoritie of Chrysostome, *Crucem non simpliciter digito in corpore, sed magna profecto fide in mente formare oportet.* And afterwards concludeth all that hee had saide before, with this most excellent rule, how the Fathers are to be vnderstood, whē they attribute any thing to this signe: *Omnia dicta Patrum, (saith he) ubi crucē, spem, redemptionem, ac salutē &c: esse volunt, intelligenda esse relatiue, vt referantur ad passionem Christi, vel ad ipsum crucifixum, signo crucis representatum:* So that not only the Fathers reposed no such vertue and efficacy in the signe, but also, if any man should vse it now, (which yet I will not commend vnto any man, by reason of the scandall it may bring with it) I hold that iudgement of Hemingius very sound, *Qui mānē surgens, et vesperi cubitum vadens, signat se cruce, in signum militiae Christianae, non est culpandus, modo absit superstitio.*

Perkins demōstr. prob. cap. de signo crucis.

Chrysost. in Mat. Hom. 55.

Hemin. in 1. ep. Ioan. cap. 5.

Secōdly you accuse them for ascribing vertue and efficacy to the signe of the Crosse, in expelling and chas-ing away of Devils, for prooffe whereof, you cite Hierome ad Demetriadem. *Lactant. lib. 4. cap. 17.* and Chrysostome in Psal. 109. All these authorities I easily grant to be true, and a number such like, in the writings of the fathers: and yet I deny that in those speeches, they ascribe any opiniō of vertue or efficacy to the sign of the Crosse. This is not mine owne opinion only, but I learne it of that excellent diuine Hier. Zanchius. I doubt not, saith he but that sometimes Satan was driven away indeede at the signe of the Crosse, as Augustine reporteth many miracles to haue

Zanch. de redemptione. lib. 6, pag. 366

Hier. Zanch. de redemptione. lib. 6, pag. 366.

haue bin done with that signe, and the Deuill allo, to haue bin chaled: De ciuitate Dei lib. 22. cap. 8. *Verū non propter vniūsigni, sed propter virtutem fidei, in Christum crucifixum, quā praeclari erant, et sunt fideles, in fugam vertebatur, atq; vertitur Diabolus.* Goulartius. 'Speaketh to the like effect: *Signum illud (crucis) ad passionem et sanguinem Christi pertinere Cyprianus testatur, Quamuis ergo veteres Christiani externo signo crucis vti sunt, id tamen fuit sine superstitione: et doctrina de Christi merito ab errore, qui postea irrepsit, pios seruauit immunes, Cyprianus huiusmodi speaketh so fully to this purpose, as any man that marketh his words cannot conceiue so grossly of the Ancients: His words be thele, Iam videt Hebraeus, et quicunq; de seruitute Aegyptia ad repromissā patriā libertatē anhelat, quod sanguis Christi efficacius, quam sanguis agni illius, quem in Aegypto Israel immolauit, contrarias abigat potestates: cuius hodie tanta est auctoritas, & potestas, ut non solum Israeliticā liminā muniat, sed etiam ab ijs qui Israeliticē non viuunt, solum Sacramenti signū repellat Daemonia, & ubicunq; conspecta fuerit, terribilis sit sacri nominis virtus, & sanguinis nota.* This testimony I haue rehearsed at large, becaule it most excellently delivereth vnto vs, as wel his own opiniō, as the opiniō of al the Ancients, touching this signe. And yet if you desire a plainer testimony, hear M. Perkins, who in most expresse & significant tearmes vtterly acquitteth thē of your vniust accusation. *Veteres (saith he) se cruce cōtra Demones munierunt, non quod externo signo crucis tantam vim & efficaciam adscripserint, sed hac solenni cerimonia suam fiduciam in crucem, id est, mortem Christi, apud alios testari, et quodam quasi monitorio fidē excitare voluerunt, quae omnia mala depellit.* And because you shall not haue the

Goulartius in Cyprian ad Demetrian, cap. 19.

Cyprianus de passion. Christi, cap. 11.

Perkins de demon. prob. cap. de signo crucis.

use of this Ceremony without a reason, *Zanchius* telleth you why it pleased God to shewe such power at the making of this signe, *ut illos in sincera fide confirmaret, qui primam ad Christi veniebant religionem.* *Zanch. loco sup. citato.*

Thirdly you accuse them for ascribing *vertue and efficacy*, to the signe of the Crosse, in consecration of the blessed Sacraments, And this you aggrauat with *Tra-gick* words. For these *superstitions*, say you, are small in regard of that *efficacy*, which in the Sacraments *Antiquity* ascribed vnto the Crosse: and this point you proue out of *S^c. Cyprian de Bapt. & passione Christi* & *S^c. Aug. 118. tract. vpon S^c. Iohn.* All these authorities I willingly acknowledg: But withal I must giue you to vnderstand, that you cite your first authority out of *S^c. Cyprian, mala fide*, For there, by the Crosse he meaneth Christs passio, wherein the Apostle *S^c. Paule* boasteth: and your second partially and to your owne aduantage, as partly hath bin told you before: For after these words: *Operationis autoritas in figura crucis, omnibus Sacramentis largitur effectum*, you should haue added that which immediately followed, *Et cuncta peragit nomen, quod omnibus nominibus eminet, a Sacramentorum Vicarijs inuocatum*, & then the latter part of the Sentence would haue cleared the former, from that most wrongful imputation that you lay vpon it. *S^c. Aug.* in that place sheweth, not how the Crosse sanctifieth, but how it signifieth. *Quando per crucem Christi quam fecerunt mali, in celebratione sacramentorum, eius bonum nobis omne signatur, & lo. Maist Perkins himselfe expounds it. demon. prob. ca. de signo crucis.*

It is a very strong and strang conceipt of yours that could induce you to thinke, that the Auncient Fathers were so simple, as to ascribe any *efficacy* of consecration of the Sacraments, vnto the *signe of the Crosse*, you cannot be ignorant, that the name or word of *consecration*, is an *Ecclesiasticall* word, of frequent vse in the matter of Sacraments, called sometimes *Sanctification* as in *Cypri-*

1. Cor. 10. 16.

an, and diuers others, sometimes ἐννοια Inuocation: as in S^r. Basill, and Theodoret, sometimes εὐλογία, Benedic-
tion, as Mat. 26: 26: Mark. 14. 22. 1. Cor. 10. 16. sometimes
εὐχαριστία, Thanksgining as Luk. 22. 19. 1. Cor. 11. 24. but
most ordinarily consecration in the writings of the Fa-
thers. Neither can you be ignorant, that S. Paule calleth
the cuppe. τὸ ποτήριον τὸ εὐλογιστὸν εὐλογούμενον. The cuppe of
blessing, which we blesse, referring this blessing not vnto
God, but vnto the cupp: inlomuch as Oecumenius expou-
deth the Apostle, as if he had said thus: τὸ εὐλογούμενον κατὰ
χρᾶσιν the cup of blessing which we blesse, that is which
we prepare with praise and thanksgining. It is euident
therfore, that the name of consecration, when we speak
of the Sacraments, is no such name as we should be a-
fraid of, hauing so good warrant for it: especially in the
Scriptures. The thing that is signified by the name,
would likewise be considered, that therby we may also
iudg, whether the Auntients be iustly taxed by the
Treatiser. The thing therfore signified by this name, was
nothing else among the Auntients, but a sequestra-
tion of the Elements, from their commō vse, and a sanc-
tifying of them, by praier, & inuocation, and thanksgue-
ing vnto God, to that holy vse which was proper to the
Sacraments: as of the water in Baptisme that it might be
sanctified, to the mysticall washing away of sins: of the
bread and wine in the Lords supper, that it might be pre-
pared & sanctified to the spirituall eating of Christs bo-
dy, and drinking of his blood. *Noster calix et panis*, saith
S^r. Augustine, *certa consecratione mysticus fit nobis, non*
naschitur: proinde, quod non ita fit, quamuis fit panis, et ca-
lix, ad iumentum est refectiois, non Sacramentum religi-
onis. Thus far the Auntient Fathers are free frō blame,
for

Aug. cons. Faust.
Manich. li. 20.
cap. 13, Tom. 6.

for even we also in our Church doe the same thing: For we likewise do by praier and invocation *sanctifie the Elements*, (which are otherwise of their owne nature ordained for common use,) that they may serue for *holy uses*: and that those things, which were before *necessary helps*, for the vse of life, and clesing of our bodies, may nowe become *effectuall signes of regeneration*, and of the body and bloud of Christ, for the nourishing of our soules. Neither doe we now in our Church abhorre the name of *consecration*, nor think the thing to noe purpose, but ascribe vnto it a certaine effect of *change*, that it worketh in the *Elements*, not of their *substance*, into an other, nor of their *naturall qualities*, (as the *Papists* conceiue their *Magicall consecration*) to effect *Transubstantiation*, but of their vse, and seruice only; that those things which were for common vse before, are now dedicated and appropriated to these *holy uses*.

Againe a man that truly esteemeth, that the Fathers ascribe no vertue nor efficacy to the sacraments themselves, wil easily free them from this imputation, of ascribing vertue and efficacy to the signe of the Crosse in Consecration. For how can any man imagine: that they which attribute the verrue and efficacy of consecrating the Elements to the signe of the Crosse, should not much more ascribe vnto the Elements so consecrated, some efficacy and vertue of themselves? Now that they ascribed no such power vnto the Sacraments themselves, nor had any conceit of *grace* to be conferred by the *opus operatum* of the Sacraments, as the schoolmē afterward conceiued, we haue most full and certaine assurance out of their owne testimonies. S. Hierome saith. *Qui plena fide non accipiunt Baptisma, non spiritum sanctum, sed*

quam percipiunt. S. Ambrose likewise to the same purpose, spiritus manus est gratiam implere mysterij. S. Augustine is plentiful in this argument. Sacramenta, non quia sumuntur, sed quia creduntur, sanctificant. And againe, in fidelibus & Electis Sacramenta hoc verè efficiunt quod figurant. And againe, Visibilis sacramenti forma, à ministro datur, ipse autem Christus invisibilem dat gratiam. And in another place, Aqua cernitur, sed qui non videtur spiritus operatur. Unde tanta vis aquæ, ut corpus tangat, & cor abluat, nisi faciente verbo, non quia dicitur, sed quia creditur? And S. Cyprian most plainly of all. Effectum sanctificationis Elementis, non propria eorum natura prabet, sed virtus divina potentius operatur, ut adsit veritas signi, & spiritus sacramento: atque ex ipsis rerum efficientijs dignitas gratiæ patefiat, & interiori homini innotescat.

Yea say you, all this were well enough, but herein the Fathers are to be blamed, because in consecration, they used the signe of the Crosse, and ascribed this consecration, & sanctifying of the Elements vnto that signe. They used the signe of the Crosse therein indeede, and thence are these speeches of theirs which you alleadged. But they ascribed not this consecration, and hallowing to the signe of the Crosse, but vnto Christes death, whereof the Lords Supper is a remembrance. Doe this in remembrance of me. And Baptisme a similitude or representation, vnto that are Baptized into Christ Iesus, are Baptized into his death, and are buried with him by Baptisme into his death, &c. And therefore in these Sacraments of Christes death, they made the signe of the Crosse, wheron he died, to signifie that it was his death, that gaue efficacie and vertue to these Sacraments. Also they ascribed this efficacie and power, not vnto the signe of the Crosse, but vnto the words of consecration, or if you wil rather so call them, of Christes

August. quest.
ex nouo Test.
39.
De unit. Chris-
tiani cap. 3.

2. Cor. 11. 24.

Rom. 6. 3. 4.

Christ's institution according to that of S. *Augustine*. *Accedat verbum ad elementum, & fit Sacramentum*. And because the words of *Christ's institution* refer vs alwaies to his death, therefore they made in the pronouncing of the, the *signe* of the Crosse, wheron he died. Hence it is, that though they vsed the *signe* of the Crosse in consecration, yet they attributed not the *vertue* of consecration vnto it, but vnto *Christ* and his *institution*. And therefore S^r. *Cyprian*, wheresoever he mentioneth the one, doeth alwaies ioin the other with it: As, *in passione crucis, et signo virtus omnis est, & potestas*; & in the examples before rehearsed, with *Figura crucis*, he ioineth *peragitur nomen invocatum*, and with *signum* repellat *demonia*, hee ioineth, *sacri nominis virtus, & sanguinis nota*. The like doth S. *Aug*. *Omnia quaecumq; sanctificantur hoc signo dominicae crucis cum invocatione Christi nominis consecrantur*.

Cyp. testim. ad Quirin. lib. 2. cap. 21.

Aug: serm 181. de Temp. vide & serm. 19. de Sanctis.

The distinction that you make between *Tert.* & *Cyp.* that *Tert.* should bee the first of the Fathers that ever mentioned the Crosse, & *Cyprian* the ancientest, that maketh mention of the Crosse in Baptisme, is a very vaine & frivolous distinction. For (to keepe my selfe within the compasse of those Ancients that I haue before cited,) both *Iustin Martyr*, before *Tertullian*, mentioneth the Crosse: & *Tertullian* himselfe, as also *Origen*, which were before *Cyprian*, make mentiō of the Crosse in Baptisme, as before I haue declared. It were superfluous, say you, to rehearse the rest, & these too, except you rehearsed the to better purpose.

Treatise. 13. Sect.

But hereby it is evident; that the religious use of the Crosse, was even at the first sinfull, and superstitious, neither can it be shewed, that it was ever used by the Fathers: *Religionis ergo sine admixta superstitione, and this in-*

• Lately in
Surrey a child
rebaptized,
because the
Crosse was o-
mitted.

uentia did no sooner creepe into the Sacramēt, but it drew vnto it selfe such superstitious conceits of efficacy & necessity, that without it, the means which God appointed for the consecration of the Elements, seemed overweake, yea vnauaileable, according as some^a amongst vs, account not their children lawfully Baptized, yea, will haue the rebaptized, if the Crosse haue bin omitted.

Answer.

This is that which you adde, by way of Corollary, to your answer, importing thus much in effect, as I conceiue: That though the *signe* of the Crosse be very *ancient*, yet *antiquity* could not free it from *sin*, and *superstition*: we doe not alleadge the *antiquity* of the Crosse, as an argument to free it from *sin* and *superstition*, which we thinke in *our use*, and in the *use* of the *Ancients*, it is not infected with. But we alleadge it, as an argument why it should not be rashly changed, and taken away, as you would haue it, both because it was ordained vpon good reason, and aduise at the first, and hath bin vled ever since, with no small profit to the Church. As for the *evidence* you talke of, it doth not yet appeare, the *use* of it in actions of *religion*, without opinion of *vertue* and *efficacie*, was ever free from *sin* & *superstition*. But to this your accusation, I shal neede to speake nothing in this place, because I haue answered it before against you, & against your grand Master T. C. Especially seeing here you bring no matter, but repeat your former equivocation of religious *vse*, and repole vnto vs your olde Crambe of *Religionis erga*, so often recocted.

Your second obiection, that this inuention did no sooner creepe into the Sacrament, but it drew vnto it selfe such superstitious conceits, of efficacy &c. Is likewise answered.

red

red in the last section, the conceite of *superstitious necessity*, that, you say, it drew vnto it, that without *Chr* is the fault of the *persons* that so conceiued of it, & not of the *signe* it selfe: For this *signe* of the Crosse *perinde est*, as *is qui vitur, bene utentibus bonum est, male utentibus malū est*, And therefore the best way to reforme this misconceite, is to instruct them aright, that doe thus superstitiously conceiue of it, A farr better way then vtterly to abolish it, as may appeare euen by your *owne example* of a *childe* lately rebaptized in *Surrey*, because the *Crosse* was omitted: For if this be true, it is manifest, that the taking of the vse of the *Crosse* cleane away, would *scādalize* & alienate more mens minds frō our church, then the retaining of it still can doe; for seeing that they that will take offence at the *remouing* of it, are the weaker: and you that knowe what belongeth, to matters of such indifferency are the stronger, it is much more agreeable to the rule of Christian charity, that you in the spirit of mildnesse should beare with their infirmities, by *allowing* the lawfully established vse therof, thē they should haue any cause of offence giuen vnto them, by the *vtter abrogating* and remouing of it. If any man among vs, vppon such conceite of *necessity* of this *signe*, as you intimate, haue caused his Child to be rebaptized, because the Crosse was omitted, Charity bids me not to doubre, but that the wisdom, & authority of our chiefe *Gouernours*, haue had an eye vnto it, & the Minister that gaue the offence, hath bin hartely sorry for his omission: For, *Take heed*, saith the Apostle, in another thing indifferent, *least by any means this liberty of yours, be an occasio* 1. Cor. 3. 9. *of falling to them that are weak*: But now we will consider your two obseruations.

Treatise. 14. Sect.

Collo. 2. 18.

Out of which may be observed, first howe dangerous a thing it is to bring in any humane invention, into the service of God, sith in the very pure age of the Church, it was punished with such a spirituall curse of horrible superstition. Secondly, though at this time Popery was not hatched, yet the mystery of iniquity was then a working, and the beginning, as it were, of the whorish fornication was found, even in the Fathers times, so that as worshipping of Angels in Paules time, prayers, and oblations for the dead, in Tertullians time, be rightly counted Popish and Antichristian, though as yet that monster was not borne, so thus and other ceremonies ratified by the Popish Canons & constitutions may well bee taken for Popish and Antichristian, even in the Fathers times, seeing they then made a waie for the Beast, and since haue receiued farther impiety, & authority from him. Wherefore, to conclude, as I say exhorteth Gods people, to keepe themselves fro the rites & pollutions of the Heathen, saying, depart, depart yee, goe out from them, and touch no vncleane thing: so the spirit in the same manner, chargeth the Church not to meddle with the corruptions of Antichristian Babilon, but goe out of her my people, saith he, that you may not bee partaker of her sinnes, and that yee receiue not of her plagues. The feare of which curse doth keepe vs from all the superstitious, and idolatrous ceremonies of that whorish Synagogue.

Answer.

Touching your first observation, How dangerous a thing it is, &c. Though I haue said sufficiently before, yet this one word I adde more by way of remembrance: That if humane invention be brought into the Church, either with a purpose to attract any thing from the in-

ſtitution of God, or to equall them to Gods ordinance, or to obſcure & darken Chriſts inſtitution, or to impoſe a yoke or burden vpon mens conſciences, or with opinion either of efficacy or neceſſity, or with mixture of impiety and ſuperſtition, or that they ſhould be eſtemed any otherwiſe of, then of things indifferent: then we confeſſe, that it is indeed a thing very dangerous to bring any humane in- uention into the ſeruiſe of God: and that the curſſe of God wil alwaies accompany ſuch inventions. But on the contrary ſide, if they be brought into the Church, only as Ceremonies, to attend Gods inſtitution, as orna- ments for decency, order, edification, and admonition, or if the cauſes, ends, and uſes, for which they were firſt inſtituted, remaine ſtill: (all which circumſtances concur, in our uſe of the Croſſe in Baptiſme,) then we lee no rea- ſon, why they may not lawfully be vled in Gods ſeruiſes; and hould them not only free from Gods curle, but alſo accompanied with his bleſſing, ſo long as they are retain- ed and obſerued with theſe limitations:

Touching your ſecond obſeruatiſon, how a thing may be iuſtly reputed Popiſh & Antichriſtian, though it were before that monſter of Popery and Antichriſt were hatch- ed. I muſt needs ſay, you bring vs to a pretty & ſtrange ſpeculation, and deriue the pedigree of Popiſh Anti- chriſtianiſme farther, then he that began the Troia war gemino ab ouo: for you fetch it from before the egge, & the Hen too, and make me to remember that vaunt of the Arcadians, that boated they were before the Moone.

That a Ceremony, that is oppoſite vnto the Doctrine & Goſpell of Chriſt, (as you wrongfully ſuppoſe this to be) may be Antichriſtian, before Popery, I doe not denie, for, Euen now, ſaith Saint Iohn of his times, there are ma- 1. Ioh. 2. 18.

2. Theff. 2.

my *Antichristes*: The *mystery of iniquity* began to worke berimes; It wrought in *Simon Magus*, and his followers, while *Christ* was yet aliue; It wrought in *Elimas the Sorcerer*, in the *false Apostles*, and in the *Nicholaitans*, in *Menander*, *Ebion*, and *Cerintus*, euen in the *Apostls* times; All these were *Antichrists*: And any *heresy* either in *doctrine* or *Ceremony*, that they held against the *truth* & word of *Christ* was *Antichristiā*. But that a thing should be *Popish* and *Antichristian*, and that before *Poperie* was hatched, is in my vnderstāding as if you should haue said, The *chicken* was a bird before the *Hen* peeped out of the shell. As in other things, so in *Antichristianisme*, *Tēpora sunt distinguenda*: or else we shal make a *confusion* of all things, and so speake of *heresies*, as if all *heresies* were but one *heresie*: and those which *S^c. Iohn* calleth many *Antichrists*, were but one *Antichrist*, called *κατ' ἐξοχὴν ὁ ἀντίχριστος*, that *Antichrist* whom you conceiue the *Papacy* to be.

Coll. 2. 18.

You proue this, a *simili*, as worshipping of *Angels* in *S. Paules time*, &c. *Antichristian* they might bee rightly counted, because they were against the *truth*, and *doctrine* of *Christ*, *Popish* they could not, because neither was *Poperie* yet heard of, nor had the *Papacy* yet imbraced those *superstitions*.

Again, that a thing should be *Popish* or *Antichristiā*, is not in the *thing*, but in the *minds* of them that make it *Popish* and *Antichristian*. For this you haue bin oftē told, that no *ceremony* can be *Popish* & *Antichristian* of it selfe:

Bucer de sacris
vest. ad Hopp.

Ritum aliquem Aaronicum esse vel Antichristianum, in nullis haeret Dei creaturis, in nulla veste, in nulla figura, in nullo colore, aut nullo Dei opere, sed in animo & professione, bonis Dei creaturis, ad impias significationes abutentium.

Things

Things are good,saith he farther, not only in their *naturall effects*,as bread in the effect of feeding, & strengthening of the body: wine,in the effect of drinking & heating:but also in their *diuers significations & admonitions*: *Quæ scriptura docet,diabolo,vel malis hominibus,eã fac- tam esse potestatem; vt abusu suo vllam queant Dei crea- turam,et bonam etiam significando et admonendo,per se malam facere et impiam?* wherefore nothing can be said to belong to the Priesthood of *Aron*,but that which is vsed to that *superstition*,as if it were *necessary and profit- able* of it selfe to *saluation*,euen now after Christ is re- ueled; or wherby some occasion,to imbrace or retaine that superstition,or to trouble the concord of Brethrẽ, may be ministred: So likewise no rite can be called *Anti- christian*,but that, wherby some *profession, and commun- ication with Antichrist* may be shewed, or may serue to that *profession or communication*: And a litle after he hath these words,very pertinent and effectuell to this purpose: *Eam enim libertatem &c.* For if any man wil lay that this liberty(of Ceremonies) may be permitted to no Church of Christ, he must needes yeeld to one or o- ther of these inconueniences,Ether that nothing is grã- ted to the Churches touching the Lords supper,but that wheteof they haue *the expresse commandement of Christ*, and then al the Churches must be condemned of wick- ed boldnes and presumtiõ &c. Or that there are not any Churches,which the Lord doth so'farre-free from al sus- pition and abuse of his good creatures,that al the good creatures of God are pure(through true faith in his nãe) to them that are pure,yea euen in their signification; which who soeuer shall lay, he therein must also denie, Christ to be that Lord,which he hath promised him-

selfe to be to al men, that is, their deliuerer from al vncleannes: Or that wicked men by their abuse can so pollute the creatures of God, which are good of themselues, as they can *serue no godly man to a godly vse*: which is manifestly against the testimony of the holy Ghost: *Rō. 14. 14. 1. Cor. 8. 4. et 9. 20. 1 Tim. 4. 4.* Or certainly that it is not lawfull for Christians, *to dispose of al things*, for *admonition of their Creator* and ours, of his *benefits* towards vs, and of our *duties* towards him: which is repugnant to that, that the holy Ghost teacheth every where, concerning the knowledg and worship of God in al his works, and doing al things in the *name of our Lord Iesus Christ, to the glory of the father.*

This testimony of Mr. Bucer I haue therefore repeated at large, because therein two things very effectual to this present questiō are delivered. *First*, that the church hath *libertie* and power to *ordaine* thinges *indifferent* in Gods service: And *secondly*, that *no abuse* of other men cā *so pollute* the creatures of God, as that the *pollution* should ever after *cleaue* to the creatures, as the Leprosie of *Naaman* did vnto *Giezz*: but the corruptiō remaining only in the *minde*s of them that did defile the creatures, they become againe *pure*, to them that are *pure*, that is, to the faithful. Whence it followeth necessarily, that nothing can be iustly reputed *Antichristian* vnto any, but vnto them that vse it to *that end*, that Antichristian profession may be advanced by it, or with that *opiniō*, that they that are Antichristian doe ascribe vnto it: whervpō it must as necessarily ensue, that seeing we in the *Church of England*, do not vse the *signe* of the Crosse in Baptism, *to aduance the professiō of Antichrist*, nor with those *opinions* that *Popish Antichristes* doe ascribe vnto it, therefore

fore vnto vs it remaineth pure and cleane, & leaveth the Popery and *Antichristianisme*, that it had, sticking stil in the mindes and consciences of Popish Antichrists. The foundation therfore of your observation being thus shaken, we will now trie the iointes and sinewes of your argument, whereby you would conclude this Ceremonie to haue bin Antichritian in the *Ancients*, and therfore must bee also such in vs. Against the *Ancients* you argue thus.

That which was the beginning, as it were, of the whorish fornications, and made way for the beast, may well be take for Popish and Antichristian.

But the abuses and opinion of vertue, and efficacy, that the Ancients had of the signe of the Crosse, were the beginnings of the whorish fornications, and made way for the beast. Ergo.

The abuses and opinion of efficacy and vertue, that the Ancients had of the signe of the Crosse, may well bee taken for Popish and Antichristian.

To the *Maior*. *That which was the beginning &c.* It is true in the, in whō it was the beginning of whorish fornications, and in whō it made way for the beast, as in *Simon Magus*, *Elimas*, the *Nicholaitans*, the *false Apostls*, and the *Heretiques*: al which, no doubt, gaue the beginnings to the whorish fornications, and made way to the beast. In the *holy fathers* that did not so, it cānot be iustly reputed *Popish*, or *Antichristian*, as hath bin declared in the last words before.

To the *Minor*: *But the abuses &c.* It is false: for the *Ancients* did not abuse it, neither had any opiniō of vertue and efficacy of it, as is shewed in the 12. sect: & therfore your cōclusiō toucheth none but the, that were for-

runners of Antichrist; It cannot touch the *Antient fathers*, that opposed themselves, to the first working of the *mystery* & resisted the *Heresies*, that made way to the Beast. Like vnto this is your reason that you make against our present vse.

That which hath since receiued farther impiety, and authority from the Antichrist, may iustly be taken for Popish & Antichristian now.

But the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme in the Church of England, hath since receiued farther impiety & authority from the Antichrist. Ergo

The signe of the Crosse in Baptisme in the Church of England, may iustly be taken for Popish and Antichristian now.

The *Major* of this argument holdeth true as the *Major* of the former did, that is, in them, in whome it hath receiued farther impiety, and authority frō Antichrist, In others in whome it hath not receiued farther impiety, it holdeth not.

The *Minor* is false, for in the Church of England the Popish abuses of the Crosse, haue receiued neither *farther impiety, nor authority*, but contrariwise are al removed; and the first *sincere vse* of the Antients is retained: For we vse this *signe* of the Crosse, in truth, to no other purpose, thē we vse the *name* or *worde* Crosse, that is, only for *signification* and *admonition*; and seeing there is no other difference betweene thē, but what the word soundeth vnto the eare, that the signe representeth vnto the eie, why should there be more fault founde with the one, thē with the other? or why should our vsing of more outward meanes, for helping our infirmities, in remembring Christs passion be misliked, Seeing in al other mat-
ters.

ters, the more meanes we vse to helpe our weakenes, the better we reckon of the: *Ex quo nostra redemptionis pretium in cruce pendit, illud ipsum crucis vocabulum ante a ignominiosissimum, nobis Christianis factum est honorificentissimum.* If the word Crosse be so honourable, because our Saviour sometimes hunge vpon the Crosse, why should the signe of the same thing be so daungerous and pernicious? And therefore your conclusion no way hurteth the Church of England, but only in the vniust calūniation, that it laieth vpon it, and in it vpon the Ancients whose reputation, and integrity, touching the Crosse, standing good as for any thing you can say against it (it alwaies wil) it is not possible for you to fasten the Popish abuses, and whorish fornications of the Romish Antichrist vpon our Church.

Beza in defen.
& reprehens.
Sebast. Castella

The exhortation, wherewith you conclude this your Treatise is good, in *Thesis* vnto al men, & even in this particuler *Hypothesis* of the Crosse in Baptisme, to the that are intangled, & defiled with Popish conceits, & superstitions. But vnto vs, that are no waies partakers of those corruptions, you might very wel haue forborne it.

The feare of a curse, least being partakers of the Romish Antichrists sins, you should also receiue of her plagues, keeps you, you say, from his superstitious Idolatries: The feare of a curse, ought, no doubt, to be a great bridle to restraine all men from doing evil. But we invite you not to be partakers of the Romish Antichrists sinnes, but only of our society, in our innocent and harmlesse Christian Ceremonies. Wherin if you fear a curse, you fear where no cause of feare is. If you fear a curse indeed, as you pretend, you shall do wel to translate this feare of yours, from the harmlesse vse of the Crosse, wherein either there is no danger

Numb. 16. 1.

Eccle. 3. 2.

Cartwright in
E. 1. cap. 8 Eccle.

at all (as we are perswaded) or no certaine danger (which your selues cannot proue) vnto the most certaine & vndoubted danger of disobedience; whervnto, without al peradventure, there is due a fearfull and seuerer curle, as we are taught by the exampls of *Corah, Dathan, and Abiram* in the booke of God: To which purpose also the wise preacher, that sought to find out pleasant words, & an vpright writing, euen the words of truth, doth aduertise vs, namely to take heed to the mouth of the King, & to the word of the oath of God, that is, as the Geneua note doth well expound it, obey the King, & keepe the oath, that thou hast made for the same cause. *Ne perturbat a facie eius abito*: For this is *radix rebellionis*, saith M. Cartwright; *Si perturbat animo ferri se patiatur: unde fit, ut pleriq; a subiectione debita deficient, cum ira, indignatione, ambitione, lucri cupiditate, ab officio discedunt*; This is the roote of rebellion, if men will suffer themselues to be caried with discontentment, from the presence of the King: whence it commeth, that many men fall from due subiection, when they depart from their duty, either for anger, or indignation, or ambition, or desier of gaine.

The conclusion to the Treatise & his friends.

And thus far I haue attended the Treatisers discours, step by step & foot by foot, omitting, as I think, nothing that is materiall: and yeelding, as I hope, iust satisfaction to al them, that with peaceable minds, & vnpartiall affectiōs shall be pleased to weigh his arguments, & my answeres in indifferent ballances: wherein if I haue done any thing that may content (though in the least degree) you to whom this answer is addressed, I shall thinke this labour of mine, wel bestowed: where vnto, as I was first moued by them, which had authority to command me,

so

so it was on my owne part most willingly vndertaken, with an earnest desire to ad if possibly I might, some drop of water to the quenching of that flame of discontentment that thus rageth amongst vs: And I trust, I may the rather hope, that some good hereby may be effected, in that I came into this worke, with a single mind, & without al eie or affection to any particular man, that might be imagined to be the writer of this Treatise: of whom, I neither had, nor yet haue, so much as the least inckling or suspition. Only the matter and argument of this Treatise, drew on my pen: which (to speake my iudgment & opiniõ of it) seemed vnto me so warily set down, as that it might both stumble a weake and vnserled reader: and also add obstinacy, & stiffnes, to minds already possessed with loue, and liking of that opinion; though it haue neither strength of argument, nor power of persuation, to winn any man vnto that conceite, that either had iudgment to descerne the manifold fallacies and captions therein vsed, or stood before contrarily affected.

That which I would now say is, to desier the Treatiser and his frends, that they would first reforme themselves, and remoue this stumbling block, which themselves, and not our Church hath laid before them, out of their owne waies. If it be, as they are wont to say, against their consciences, thẽ to reforme the error of their owne consciences, which no doubt, they may doe, by informing their consciences aright, and laying true *Science* as the surest foundation of their consciences; If otherwise it be but only feare, least they may seeme by yeelding to haue ouer seene themselves, and hauing sörimes preached against this Ceremony, may be acculed of leuity & inconstancy in their doctrine, and so consequently bring

on some discredit, vnto their Ministry let thē know, that al theſe are but *humane respects*, and can no way be al-
 leadged, as iuſt cauſes, why they ſhould break brother-
 ly amity and concord, and make a rent and diſſenuō in
 the Church of God. Neither can theſe outward reſpects
 giue any iuſt excuſe, to diſobedience, & oppoſition, a-
 ga inſt the *Magiſtrat*, & *laws eſtabliſhed*: which being of
 things indifferent, made for preſeruatiō of order & de-
 cency in the Church, *bind their conſciences*: and that re-
 ſiſtance, that is made againſt them, is made againſt the
ordinaunce of God.

Secundly, I doe very hartily deſire them to conſider
 howe great a *miſchiefe* they haue brought vpon our
 Church: what breach of *Chriſtian charity* among our
 ſelues, which being al of one houſhold, ſhould bee all of
 one minde; and what reioycing and courage they haue
 given to our common enemy, *ὡς καὶ γινώσκουσιν ἀντιπάλους ἀντιπάλους*
deuides: How the *Papiſts* reioice to ſee this iar amongſt
 vs: how *Papery* dayly doth preuaile, and take ſtrength, &
 hart, by occaſion of this breach. How much better were
 it, to turne theſe forces that are ſpent vpon our ſelues, a-
 gainſt the commō aduerſary? who (as lamentable expe-
 riēce hath taught vs) maketh this ſtrife of ours, a fit oc-
 caſion and inſtrument to overthrow our common faith.
 As lately did appeare moſt manifeſtly, when they ende-
 uored to cloake their barbarous, and inhumane cruelty,
 with the colour of your diſcōtētmēt againſt the ſtate. Ful
 of rage and malice is Satan now towards the laſt rime of
 his hopes: he worketh every way, & laieth al his ſnares to
 deceiue the ſimple: in ſome by *pretended zeale*: in ſome
 by *deluſions* and *false impoſtures*: in ſome by *diuelliſh plots*
 and *deſperate deſignes*: and generally in all ſorts of men,
 by

by heaping *disgraces* and contempt vpon the *reuerende* *Cleergie*, and Ministry of this Church. as if they were the only lets, that hindered the full strengthening and perfecting of his kingdome.

These things and many other grievous sins, & works of darknes, that blush not now to shew themselves in the open day, could not thus swarme amongst vs, as daylie they doe, if we all truly intended the same thing: if vvee could faithfully & vnfainedly giue one another the right hand of fellowship, and seriously doe the Lords worke with one consent. My hartie desire therefore, & earnest request is, that you with vs, & we with you, would rightlie consider these things: and knowing that our *holy Ministry* in preaching of Christ crucified, is the most forcible waie, wherby it pleaseth God to weaken the strength & bodie of sin, giue our selues wholie to that worke: that laying aside these questions of Ceremonies, that haue now a long time troubled our peace, our contentiō hēce forth may be against them, that differ from vs in the substance of our saving faith: That so God may give a blessing to our labours, and wee all with one mouth, and one minde may glorifie God the Father of our Lorde Jesus Christ.

FINIS.

